NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 06824721 6

WAS CHRIST IN ADAM

JOHN MILLER

MAR 27

Miller

ZFHD

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

(*In Cloth.*)

NEW WORKS.

1. THEOLOGY. Pp. 271. (12mo.)	$1 00
2 COMMENTARY ON ROMANS. Pp. 390. (8vo.) .	1.50

NEW EDITIONS.

3. ARE SOULS IMMORTAL? 3d Ed. Pp. 178. (12mo.)	.80
4. WAS CHRIST IN ADAM? 3d Ed. Pp. 97. (12mo.)	.60
5. IS GOD A TRINITY? 3d Ed. Pp. 152. (12mo.)	.70
6. QUESTIONS AWAKENED BY THE BIBLE, (being Nos. 3, 4 & 5 in one volume).	1.25
7. FETICH IN THEOLOGY. 3d Ed. Pp. 264. (12mo.)	1.00
8. THEOLOGY AND FETICH IN THEOLOGY (in one volume)	1.50
9. COMMENTARY ON PROVERBS 2d Ed. Pp. 721. (8vo.)	2.00
10. METAPHYSICS. Pp. 430. (8vo.) . . .	1.50
11. CREED. (In paper.)	.10
Nos. 2, 6 & 8 (when mailed or bought together). .	3.50
" 2, 6, 8 & 9 (when mailed or bought together). .	5 00
" 2, 6, 8, 9, 10 & 11 (when mailed or bought together).	6.00

Mailed post-paid on receipt of price and furnished to the trade by the

EVANGELICAL REFORM PUBLICATION CO.,

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY.

THE TRADE ALSO SUPPLIED BY

CHARLES T. DILLINGHAM, 678 Broadway, New York;
J. B. LIPPINCOTT CO., 715 & 717 Market Street, Philadelphia;
A. C. MCCLURG & Co., 117 to 121 Wabash Avenue, Chicago;
C. H. WHITING, 168 & 170 Devonshire Street, Boston.

Price, 60 cts.

WAS CHRIST IN ADAM?

BY

REV. JOHN MILLER.

THIRD EDITION.

PRINCETON, N. J.:
EVANGELICAL REFORM PUBLICATION CO.,
1887.
Mailed post-paid by this Company on receipt of price.

THE NEW
PUBLIC LIBR
657338
ASTOR, LENOX AN
TILD N FOUNDA
R 1914 L

COPYRIGHT,
1877,
By JOHN MILLER.

Press of W. L. Mershon & Co.,
Rahway, N. J.

PREFACE.

I KNOW of no authority, ancient or modern, for the doctrine I am about to promulgate. I have heard of something of the kind in Vinet: but I have searched his writings, though not, I confess, all of them, and find adverse, rather than favoring, intimations.* It makes one shiver to go on so exposed a road, without any company; but there are certain mitigating circumstances which it is fair to quote.

1. In the first place, this book would not have been so much as thought of, but at the suggestion of the Bible. Philosophy, for the person of Christ, seems vain and impertinent. We cannot employ it even afterward, when our faith has been revealed. We confess nothing of research or venture in this direction. It certainly soothes a timid scruple to know, that, even if this work were a mistake, the promptings to it have been altogether Scriptural; I mean by that, it has been in reading the Bible, that

* While going through the press, a friend sends us a volume of Irving. We are not in time thoroughly to study his belief; but find him accenting the peccableness of Christ; speaking of the graciousness of His being kept holy; but not accounting for it by federal descent; and, therefore, receding too much away from it again, when arraigned for it as heresy.

the suggestion has come, of the mistake of the prevailing Christologies. There, too, we invite the debate. We suspect that what is old has been a philosophy; and we offer the new to be settled entirely by revelation.

2. In the second place, we are cheered by great simplicity of the texts.

3. And in the third place, we hope to make this appear. The very newness may be one harbinger of hope. There having been no trial in the church, and no statements opposite recorded in the world,—who knows what may happen? What seems so plain to us, may seem plain, in the same texts, to others. There may be a healing, as the surgeons say, "by the first intention;" especially, as we reach a much warmer faith; making Christ more our Christ; bringing him a great deal nearer to the curse; seating him a great deal closer to his people; and lifting a great deal higher, that righteousness of the cross, by which humanity must obtain redemption.

JNO. MILLER.

PRINCETON, Sept. 5th, 1876.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 9

I.

REASONS FOR THE OLD DOCTRINE 13

CHAPTER I.

CHRIST ONE PERSON 13

CHAPTER II.

CHRIST BORN OF A VIRGIN 24

II.

REASONS FOR THE NEW DOCTRINE 28

CHAPTER I.

CHRIST AND MAN 28

CHAPTER II.

CHRIST AND WOMAN 33

CHAPTER III.

CHRIST AND DEATH 35

CHAPTER IV.

CHRIST AND LIFE 43

CHAPTER V.

PAGE

CHRIST AND THE SPIRIT 50

CHAPTER VI.

CHRIST AND RANSOM 56

CHAPTER VII.

CHRIST AND JUSTIFICATION 70

CHAPTER VIII.

CHRIST AND ADOPTION 73

CHAPTER IX.

CHRIST AND SANCTIFICATION 76

CHAPTER X.

CHRIST AND ORDINANCES 79

CHAPTER XI.

CHRIST AND GLORIFICATION 83

CHAPTER XII.

CHRIST AND GOD 86

III.

CONCLUSION 91

INTRODUCTION.

THE sixteenth question of "The Shorter Catechism" is as follows,—"Did all mankind fall in Adam's first transgression?" The answer is, "The covenant being made with Adam, not only for himself, but for his posterity, all mankind, *descending from him by ordinary generation*, sinned in him, and fell with him, in his first transgression."

It would be hazardous to pause upon the meaning of the doctrine, for it would delay and confuse us. Men have differed about the sense of imputation. Some have thought it natural. Some have thought it federal. All have thought it real: but have been entirely at variance as to the nature of the hereditary result. The writer thinks it both natural and righteous, and that it is stated so to be in the two lists of texts that are quoted by the different polemics. He thinks it natural, like the descent of a bad plant from a bad seed. He thinks it righteous, to justify such a descent. He thinks God has arranged the universe so that like produces like, but that, when it comes to moral intelligences, there must be law, as well as nature: there must be the fact of a moral adjudication. It will not do to wave the hand, and say, All perish, by a fiat of nature; but there must be a forensic cause:

that is, the seal of heredity, in the instance of man, must be applied by juridic rule, that God may be just, though he breed hereditary bondsmen out of all mankind.

Not positing, however, the justness of such a view, we give it merely as an example, and fall back to the more universal ground, that *some* effect has been transmitted, of Adam upon man; and state, now, the universal thought, that that effect has not been a heritage to Christ, or in any way natural to him by blood relationship. He has been thought a new man, foisted in upon our race; or, if that word is connected with the idea of falsehood,* then, grafted in upon it, with no hereditary descent, but able to begin, with quite unimplicated nature, to take *our* guilt, and to cut off our hereditary taint, by his own independent sacrifice.

Now, our object is to point out the opposite doctrine as the doctrine of the word of God.

We believe that Jesus Christ was an elected man; and, with reverence be it spoken, that you or I might have been the chosen one for the incarnation of the Most High. We believe that this is taught laboriously, in plain terms, under both the dispensations. We believe that he was a child of Adam, and an heir to him, like you or me. And, inasmuch as this would have brought him into sin like you or me, we believe that his birth of the virgin, and his conception by the Holy Ghost, was to cut off this taint of nature. He was "holy, harmless, undefiled, SEPARATED † from sin-

* Fr. *Fausse.*

† "*Separate*" (E. V.). It is the Perfect:—"*that had been separated;*"

ners, and made higher than the heavens" (Heb. vii: 26). We believe, further, that, inasmuch as he could not be cut off from sin, except as the effect of ransom, Daniel and Job and Abraham were saved no otherwise than the humanity of Christ. Daniel and Job were saved retroactively; and so the person of Christ, being made up of God and man—of God, quite unimplicated by guilt,—and of man, quite implicated by it, that is, to the full extent of a descent from Adam,—we believe that the divine nature saved the human; that is, that the glory of the God (Rom. vi: 4) and the obedience of the man (Rom. v: 19) worked an entire emancipation; and that the effect of it was, not simply to save the dead Daniel and all the millions of the saints, but the millions and One; that is, the Head of the Church, and all the millions of his believing brethren.

May I beg that this may not be considered a philosophic venture? It was suggested to me by a singular look of passages of Scripture.

Let my doctrine not be misunderstood. I believe Christ to be very God, and, as such, Jesus, that is God a Saviour. But I believe him also to be very man. And I find him in the Bible, not taking refuge behind his birth of Mary, but standing out as though a dead man had he been left to the flesh (1 Pet. iii: 18), and owing his life, by ten thousand asseverations of the fact (Is. lxiii: 5; Heb. ix: 12), to that ransom from death, when he offered for himself and for the errors of the people.

i. e., not separated after being one of them, but, that, *a parte ante*, had been separated.

Let me be very precise, therefore. Jesus Christ was a child of Adam. Being such, he was guilty, as being in the loins of his fathers; or, in whatever manner all are guilty before they are born into the world. As such, he was a dead man according to the flesh. As such, he needed a ransom; and won it, when he broke the bands of death for himself and his people. As such, he must antedate the purchase, like Job or Samuel. As such, he must be perfect, and must be regenerated from the womb; nay, never regenerated, because never fallen: and as such, therefore, gloriously born; not needing a father; but wrapped, before the possibilities of sin—before his very conception—in a birth of the Spirit.

Christ, therefore, was of guilty parentage, though only of a woman: he was of a wicked nature by right of descent; its wickedness, though not its infirmity, being cut off from him by the Holy Ghost: nevertheless he had to keep that holiness, and win it further, by hard trials of temptation: and herein lay his torture: He resisted even unto blood (Heb. xii: 4); and, being "obedient unto death," (Phil. ii: 8), he was made "perfect through sufferings" (Heb. ii: 10), and obtained, even for himself, "eternal redemption" (Heb. ix: 12).*

* "*For us*" (E. V.) is in Italics. Such liberties shonld not be taken.

I.

REASONS FOR THE OLD DOCTRINE.

CHAPTER I.

Christ One Person.

We tried the experiment, once, of offering our doctrine of Christ to a distinguished and very judicious theologian. We were curious to see what would be his first impulse of thought in taking up an objection to our idea. We were not long in suspense. His mind seemed to strike at once upon the thought, that the God and man in Christ were one person, and that, therefore, it was impossible to suppose, that one was glorious and divine, and the other under bonds and guilty.

Let us state this in dialectic form.

1. Jesus Christ is God and man. The God in Christ is too unspeakably perfect to unite himself in eternal Sonship with anything guilty or accursed. Such is the first difficulty.

2. Second; Christ has a forensic unity. He is a person in court. The name is above every name; and it must have a distinct personal acceptance, or else it could never serve to stand in the place of a

deceived and accursed people. This is the second obstacle to our thought. If Christ be condemned and accursed himself, the Vicar needs some substitutionary victim; and how can God arrange, himself to save, if, in the very person of his Son, the court holds him as himself amenable?

3. Thirdly; as to mediation. The parties are, the King and the rebel. The theory has always been, that a free substitute steps between. If Christ is guilty, what mediatorship can we conceive? Not his divinity, for that it is that has been offended; and not his humanity, for that is condemned itself. Where is our resting place for thought, if the daysman that comes in, himself requires reconciliation, and a sacrifice to save him?

Now, as to the whole argument, we beg to say, that it has a confession which we will not admit. It holds to a rational appeal. What claim is there that we should be called into such a court? We have stated that, in reason, we have been children; that we did not travel that way; that we were waked up by the inspired oracle; that we were ready with a bundle of texts; and that we were afraid that it would be imagined that we had been seduced by reason, and by the decoy lights of some favorite scheme of heresy.

We had thrown ourselves, therefore, with uncommon care upon the mere dogma of the Book; and, therefore, had gathered up all our part of the discussion upon assorted texts, the bundles of which were to mark the chapters, and give shape to our discussion.

Let me lodge the plea, therefore, that it is the old doctrine that offends by rationalism. So seemed it when this learned friend first struck upon his reply. We propounded to him texts of Scripture. *Our* reasoning was the mere mortar that coupled together the assertions of the text. But his was a rationalistic appeal. To appear in court, there must be a person. To appear effectually, he must be responsible and free. To be One Person with God, he must be worthy of such a seat. And, to be Mediator, he must be his own independent actor in the field, exempt of all personal debt, and entering, as an untrammelled substitute, upon the enfranchisement of his people.

We protest, therefore.

But, premising that, we meet the arguing, destitute as it is of any inspiration.

1. In the first place, who is to decide who the great Jehovah may, or may not, unite with, as One Person? It seems, he does unite with a man; and that man has great infirmities of attribute. He is tempted (Heb. ii: 18). He is weak (Matt. xxvi: 41). He is timid (Matt. xxvi: 39). He is mortal (Heb. ii: 14). He shrinks from the lot that he encounters (Lu. xxii: 42). He is tempted in all respects like as we are, yet without sin (Heb. iv: 15). Moreover He is despicable (Is. xli: 24). He is ignorant (Mar. xiii: 32). He is finite (Jo. v: 19). He grows in wisdom and favor; and if he is not accursed by heritage and by covenanted oath, it is almost the only weakness that has been debarred by the decree that brought him into being. Now, what exactly is the objection

to the view we take? It will be said, God cannot be incarnated in a sinner. But our view is, Christ was not a sinner. He was kept from being so by his own redemption. In his first embrace of his Godhead he was sanctified, and that perfectly. In fact he never knew taint, because, by the effect of his atonement, he was created sinless, and God never came into unity with a transgressor.

But it will be said, He was guilty; or, with a little difference, he would have heired guilt if he had not been ransomed; nay, he may be counted to have been implicated, till his work had saved him; and it was incompetent for the Great I AM to yoke His person with an heir of Adam.

Well, let us look at that. There is certainly a boldness in it that looks like rationalism. Let us drive it to be precise.

What is it? "The temple of God is holy" (1 Cor. iii: 17). There can be no communion between Christ and Belial (2 Cor. vi: 15). God could not be tempted of evil (Jas. i: 13); and, therefore, he would not have linked his life with that of an apostate who had descent from Adam. But we claim that he was not an apostate; that he was redeemed from apostacy. We claim that he was not sinful, but that he was redeemed. The gist of the objection, therefore, is, that he needed redemption; that, before all time, he was contemplated as guilty; and that, as much as you or I; he had inculpation from Eve, and would have been both sinful and accursed, but for the effect of his own redemption.

Then, let us move still closer.

If guilt is the point, let us know distinctly when and how. He never became personally guilty, for he was enfranchised from it before he was born. But just there, where is the reasoning? Was it that he was by nature guilty? See then how much is arrogated for reason! Here was a man that was born to be accursed. He was decreed to be guilty for the sins of all mankind. Such was the structure of his person. He was conceived of as one to be accursed. And, centuries before he came, he had been levied on, and men had gotten into peace on the faith of the curse to be laid on their Redeemer. He was, therefore, guilty in a most shocking way; for there came crowding upon him, by decree, the sins of all that might be forgiven. Now, that must be a bold intellect that shall attempt to decide,—God may become incarnate with a man who is covered over with guiltiness; but it must be of one sort, and not of another. There is no question of personal guilt as the result of personal transgression, for no one impeaches him of that. But, of the two sorts that remain, God may become incarnate with man, if he sustain superhuman guilt, be it only of the men whom he is to redeem; but God may not become incarnate in man, if he sustain Adam's guilt; that is if he be born of an ungodly line, and must expiate his measure of hereditary inculpation.

Such, then, is our answer. It is not an argument, but a mere unveiling of the facts. If our adversary will admit our exhibition, we appeal from the court, and refuse to be tried. We are going to bring texts of Scripture: and, as to the points *in thesi* in the

case, we deny the competency of reason to declare that God may become incarnate with man when he has the guilt of millions, but may not become incarnate with man when impended over by his own guilt, that is, the guilt of the act in which all mankind stood together in an accursed relation.

2. And so, disposing of the difficulty that a guilty heir cannot be one person with the Almighty, we advance to the second, which is that a guilty heir cannot be a free sacrifice.

Now, let us inquire into this, with the necessary thoroughness.

A free sacrifice, as a notion to be applied to Christ, must imply a freedom in either of two particulars; first, in its being unincumbered; and second, in its being voluntary; and, in both of these respects, our doctrine would be opposed, as denying the freedom of redemption.

But let us look at both. In the first place, what is meant by being unincumbered? If Christ were a sinner, all parties would agree that he could not atone for sin. But that he should be guilty, all parties agree. In the days of Adam, Abel left upon Him guilt. Christ was not yet born, and yet Heaven had settled that; and Abel was redeemed, solely on the faith that Christ should become guilty. It soberly appears, therefore, that Christ was a guilty man long before he came into the world. It appears that he was righteously guilty; and, though all agree that he never was, and never was to be, personally sinful, yet, under one imputation, he certainly was involved, and the only question is, was he so under the

other? Under the covenant of grace he was born with millions of guiltinesses. Under the covenant of works, was he an heir of Adam's guilt? To say, He decidedly was not, and to argue it on the plea of a free sacrifice, and to say, He never could have atoned for man, if by nature he was an heir to death, and to appeal to this as of the alphabet of the cross, is beyond all question rationalism; for it pretends to say, Christ could buy me off, if all mankind were upon his shoulder, but not if Adam were; or, to speak more plainly, he could be considered a free sacrifice if encumbered with all the lost, but not free if incumbered for himself; that is, God, who knows no heritage or birth, could give price-availing value to the man with whom he chose to be incarnate, but it must be a price-availing value sufficient only for millions, and not for the one humanity, descended from Adam, which God has chosen to take into union with Himself.

Now, I say, This is rationalism.

And there is a plain victory in store for our side of the case, if we say, Our appeal is solely to Scripture: grant that Christ never sinned, and that he was redeemed, *ab ovo*, from all his guiltiness; and grant that we are successful with our Scriptures; and grant that the Scriptures show that he bought off the whole churchly body; and grant that they expressly teach that he broke the bars of the pit, and let himself out, as well as his disciples,—and we may laugh at the difficulties of the theorist. Grant only that he was born sinless, and that that escape from Adam was purchased, like yours or mine, and

no mortal is such a practitioner on high, that he understands the law of the case, and can rule that the God Christ can buy off the millions of the church, but cannot buy off the man Christ, when the God Christ is unincumbered of descent, and is known to be the basis of all the liquidation.

And, in the second place, in respect to what is *voluntary*. It is known that Christ was incumbered long before he was begotten of Mary. God's share in the plan must be that which is chiefly looked upon as unincumbered and voluntary. God *was* free in all time, and yet not free in one particular, viz., free to do wrong; and it would have been wrong not to have embraced the methods of redemption. But, in all juridic views, in which we are now only to speak, God began this scheme long before there was any bond, and before there was any motive but the eternal wisdom which had embedded him in his whole decree. At that ancient time the true ideas emerge. God was voluntary. And God was utterly unincumbered. There was no Adam to implicate guilt. On the side of the Almighty, we get the fullest idea of an unincumbered and free Redeemer. But on the side of man it is different, a little. The *Man* appeared with centuries of steps taken for him, and no questions asked as to his will. The Man was born of the Virgin with a price upon his head. His leave was not asked, but millions of men had been born to life upon his guiltiness. This is not altogether voluntaryism. It *was* voluntary; and the Scripture makes much of that account. But it was voluntary *quo ad hoc*. *God* was in Christ. The eternal voluntaryness

reigned, and was accepted in his nature. But it was not voluntary * as it had been in the beginning; for, already, millions had been bargained by it, and implications had been had, that would have made it a sin in the Man if he had not kept up to the bargain of the God. "Thy vows are upon me," he says.

So then, now, in the other respect. If Christ had his share in Adam, he was where he had been put by the will of the Father. He was no more implicated than by us. If he had to offer, first for his own guilt, and then for the people, it is but to show his shareholding under both covenants. And to say, Reason forbids it, is to uphold the sternest rationalism. Quit of all personal sin, we have carried the Saviour far enough for logic; and then, how he came so, whether by being a *novus homo*, or by being "the first born from the dead," must be a matter of revelation; and he is a bold rationalist who says, There is freedom and chance, if Christ had no guilt from Adam, but no freedom and no chance at all, if he had to be washed from his own guilt, and redeemed by his own ransom from his own share of the curse, and born of the Virgin, to secure retroactively entire quickening.

3. And now, one thing more; as to our Mediator.

* Christ says, "I lay it down of myself;" but he immediately says, "This commandment have I received of my Father" (Jo. x: 18). The very bloodiest moment of his life he approaches in this way:—'But that the world may know that I love the Father; and as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do"(Jo. xiv: 31). "For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me" (Jo. vi: 38). The sacrifice was voluntary, therefore; but, like the worship of the blest, voluntary, yet commanded.

The argument here is, If Christ be one with Adam, and is himself, *quoad* the earlier covenant, bound for Adam's sin, he is himself of the party of the guilty. And what becomes then of the idea of a go-between? Being himself of Adam, and acting for himself, the idea of an inter-nuncial messenger seems mightily obscured. To all which we reply, by charging again a hardy rationalism. A days-man, in the instance of our race, is a third person. There is a king, and there is a culprit, and there is a third man who lays his hand upon both. Nobody pretends to this in the instance of our Redeemer. Paul specially demurs, and teaches that the whole thing is an imperfect illustration. And the difficulty lies here: God is one party, and man another, but the Mediator is obscured under any theory. The Mediator is also God, and the Mediator is also man; and, even though we were to throw him out as an actual heritor with man, he would still remain "one body" (Rom. xii: 5). He delights to speak of himself as the head with the members. And, therefore, he is really of both parties. He delights to speak of himself as God (our Confession phrases it "very God"), and he delights to speak of himself as man, and, therefore, under any supposable theory, he is not a mediator of any usual kind. And, therefore, the spell of any sharp rationalistic arguing is broken. Paul says, "Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one" (Gal. iii: 20). And demurring, therefore, to the idea of mediation as actually precise, he leaves us to canvass Scripture. If God is one, and therefore a mediation within his own substance must

be of a peculiar kind, and man is one, because, as Christ claims, he is of one body with his people, then to call Christ a Mediator at all, is but an approach to the truth; and to go further, and say, Christ mediates for himself, does not so far increase the difficulty as to make any appreciable difference in the argument as based upon mediation.

We would mark Christ thus:—He is the offended God: he is also the offending man. He is the offended God, as being of the same substance. He is the offending man, as being a natural heir of our apostacy. He is a mediator in but a partial sense: first, as separated from God by his humanity; second, as separated from man by his divinity (a mediatorship, therefore, thus far, rather as compound than as simple); thirdly, from his being unlike man in obedience; fourthly, from his being unlike God in suffering; and fifthly, from his whole sacrificial work. See how this last unifies him. He could not do it as God, from its humiliation. He could not do it as man, from its atoning value: and, nevertheless, he did do it, and thereby stood out from his race. And it is this blended One, thus standing out from our humanity, that became the Mediator; God, on one side, and man, on the other; God, on one side, and, therefore, not a mediator there; and man, on the other, and, therefore, not a mediator there; but a mediator when united into one—a chosen member of our race, in whom the great God was to be incarnate; who was to stand representing all his people; who, though weak, was never to be lost by weakness, but was to be clothed with power; who, though pec-

cable, was never to be allowed to sin, but was to be filled with the Spirit; and who, though guilty, was never to be born in guilt, but was to be snatched from corruption before his very beginning, and was, in this way, to become mediator—not as God, for there he is one, and not as man, for there he is a party too, but as God and man, in that middle position in court, in which he brings into the case the representation of both natures.

Christ's being one with God, is not irreconcilable, therefore, in its thought, with Christ as being an heir of Adam.

CHAPTER II.

Christ Born of a Virgin.

A READER, who shall have followed us thus far, will very probably throw off, with impatience, the charge of rationalism. Is not ours the old doctrine, he will say? and therefore, he will feel, as I always did, that the Scriptures must be full of it. Where did men get it, he will be ready to exclaim, unless it has been the burden, all the time, of the Christian revelation?

Now, Has it been? That is exactly what we wish to press. If the Scriptures be all full of it, mention fifty—nay, coming down as Abraham did, mention thirty—mention twenty—nay, mention ten—give us *five* simple Scriptures that make it at all to be understood that Christ was not of Adam when he came into the world. The pressure upon the mind of the reader, even though it be a thing altogether negative,

must have its effect. Where, in all the Bible, do you find a passage that testifies of a created Christ; of a Christ superinduced upon our line; of a Saviour cut off, by intention, from descent; an imitated man, rather than one hereditarily derived from our accursed ancestors?

There floats in many a mind the single sentence, "A body hast thou prepared me:" but, besides the singular fact that that is not the original; but that the original favors weakness and stupidity and deafness of nature as native to Christ, and reads, "Mine ears hast thou opened;" in addition to all this,—the sentence, if it were correctly in the Hebrew, would be but a slender base on which to build such a substantial teaching.

In all the Bible, therefore, there remains but one other passage, and that is, The Birth from the Virgin. We had not advanced a page, before, beyond all doubt, every body thought of this imagined testimony to the separateness of the Redeemer.

We are to treat this argument in an after part of our book; but we cannot afford to postpone it. One fact about it now! There are four considerations that make it utterly inadequate to answer its end in the reasoning.

1. In the first place, there is nothing natural to answer to it. A mother's son is just as much a heritor as a father's son. Intellect, virtue, good looks, strength, and stature, are more often inherited, many men think, from the mother, than from the other side. But all that apart. The question was never made practical but once. Beyond all manner

of doubt there is not a farthing of value to the consideration that the man hands down the traits, beyond the thought that it may be done by the woman. So much for nature.

2. Now for Scripture. There is not a line of Scripture that explains the transaction this way.

3. On the contrary, thirdly; we are distinctly taught that Christ was a child of Adam—that he was a child of Abraham—that he was a child of David. His maternal birth was never for a moment federally dwelt upon. On the contrary, as we shall afterward see, the Scripture delights to call him a "Branch"—to speak of his growing up "from beneath" (Zech. vi: 12); to speak of his mortal flesh; to speak of his "being a dead man according to the flesh" (1 Pet. iii: 18); and to talk of him in all those ways which never relax for a moment into any relief by showing what he gained from his mother.

4. Lastly, his miraculous birth is explained. It is necessary, considering him lost.

Reverse all the usual ideas. Consider him guilty. That is; in the loins of his fathers, and as an heir like us, suppose him to be putatively dead. Then suppose him to be elect, and to be chosen, before all time, to be the prophet of his people. Suppose that he is to be God; that is, that he is to be the temple of God incarnate. Suppose that, on account of this amazing glory, he is a prince, and that what he suffers is as though all suffered, and that, as he obeys, that is to win for him the obedience of all mankind—I say, His birth of a virgin is necessary to inwrap him with the Spirit: he must be holy, harmless, separated from

sinners, and made higher than the heavens—to be all this, he must be redeemed—to be redeemed, his human part must get a share from his expiatory labor —to perform that labor, he must be perfect—to be perfect, he must be sanctified from the womb, nay, he must be perfect in the earliest conception of his being —and to be so, he must be born, not like you or me when we are born again, and not like Jeremiah if he was converted from the womb, but like his own blessed self, born as a "holy thing," in the womb of the Virgin Mary, under the power of the Holy Ghost, that, though inheriting weakness from his mother, he might be cut off from sin by that perfect shrouding of his nature, *ab ovo*, in the grace that sanctifies.

For these reasons we think this noted narrative to be less against us than in our favor, and wish to be distinctly understood ;—Our Christ is a Prophet like us (Deut. xviii: 15); infinitely far from us in his divinity; and infinitely better off than we, in that he was regenerated from the womb ; but perfectly at one with us in his descent from Adam, and liable to all our curse through his mother's guiltiness, were he not bought off by the work which he was yet to finish, through his glorious Godhead.

II.

REASONS FOR THE NEW DOCTRINE.

CHAPTER I.

Christ and Man.

If Christ were a new creation, and grafted by a second covenant in upon the body of our race, care would not be taken to make all our humanity one, and to make Christ so distinctly as he is made, a part of the aggregate man.

This begins in the very first chapter of the Scriptures. They seem to delight to call men *man*, and to give no separate name to Adam but this name *man* (Adam), the name of all mankind.

Hence it is a puzzling thing to translate, in certain passages. "This is the book of the generations of man (Adam). In the day that God created man (Adam), in the likeness of God made he him. Male and female created he them; and blessed them, and called their name man (Adam), in the day when they were created. And man (Adam) lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth: and the days of man (Adam), after he had begotten Seth,

were eight hundred years; and he begat sons and daughters. And all the days that man (Adam) lived were nine hundred and thirty years: and he died" (Gen. v: 1–5). Another fragment (if we adopt the idea of many good men, that Moses under divine inspiration selected from among these ancient annals), confirms in the most careful way this desire of unitizing humanity. "God said, Let us make man (Adam). . So God created man (Adam) in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them" *etc.* (Gen. i: 26–28). And again, "The Lord God formed man (Adam) dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man (Adam) became a living soul" (Gen. ii: 7).

This is one stage.

Now, another.

"Let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth" (Gen. i: 26; see also 28).

David, thousands of years afterward, repeats this, "Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands: thou hast put all things under his feet" (Ps. viii: 6). And Paul, a thousand afterward, lifts this quite out of the category of a common dominion, and ascribes it to Glorified Man. "For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come whereof we speak. But one in a certain place testified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou

visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the angels: thou crownedst him with glory and honor, and didst set him over the works of thy hands: thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him" (Heb. ii: 5–9). Why not? Christ was long since glorified. And Paul states that. "We see Jesus crowned with glory and honor." But see, now, his blessed doctrine! *All* saved humanity is to be crowned. That is the waiting consummation. We are to see the kingly Adam. And as MAN was to "have dominion," we see not yet all things put under *him* (Adam). "But we see Jesus," the Head and Prince and God: *He* is glorified; but not the entire man: the finest attestation we can dream of His being of the one humanity.

And not only so: the Bible is not only careful to make all humanity one, but it shows how. It does not leave us to those realistic follies which make all man sin personally, and by whimsical presence in the Garden of Eden, a conceit so brainless that it stains polemics, but it treats all hereditarily, and manages the unity of man naturally, and by the matter of birth. Christ, in this way, holds of Adam all through the word of God. Paul, in his very comment on the Psalm, viz., that man is to have dominion, and that Christ, who now has dominion, is but a part of man, fortifies that conception by words that cannot be mistaken; for he says, "Both he that sanctifieth, and they that are sanctified, are all of one: for which

cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren ; saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren ; in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee (Heb. ii : 11, 12). And so of other passages. What we find proved is, that Christ is Adam-born, like Tamar, or like Amon, or like any other in the list of his progenitors. The Bible makes no difference. In settling for us a creed, Paul tells us that He was "born of the seed of David according to the flesh' (Rom. i : 3). Antioch is to receive him as "this man's seed," viz., David's (Acts xiii : 23). Isaiah discourses upon him as "out of the stem of Jesse" (Is. xi : 1) ; nay, as "a root out of a dry ground" (Is. liii : 2). Zechariah makes him "grow up from beneath" (Zech. vi : 12). And Moses (Deut. xviii : 15), quoted afterward by Peter (Acts iii : 22), gives it with almost startling plainness. It justifies the speech that Christ was elected (Is. xlii : 1), and anointed (Is. lxi : 1), and set up (Ps. ii : 6), and ordained (Acts xvii : 31), like Saul or David out of the multitudes of Israel. For listen to the language, " Jehovah thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me."

Boldness seems the last thing that the men of inspiration seem inclined to fear. Isaiah calls him an abomination (Is. xli : 24). He says, He made dust his sword, and driven stubble his bow (Is. xli : 2) ; meaning by that, that the human part of Christ, except through Him that raised up the righteous man, was like what Zechariah calls him, " a brand plucked out of the fire" (Zech. iii : 2). Hosea says, " I called my son out of Egypt" (Hos. xi : 1). And

now, dwelling upon this, there can be no doubt that this is the whole gospel mystery. Matthew studs his chapters with these pregnant quotations from the prophets. "That it might be fulfilled," he says—(and surely he would not load his verse with mere puerile allusion): "He came and dwelt," he says, "in a city called Nazareth: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene" (Matt. ii: 23). Now, what are we to understand? Nothing trifling, beyond all manner of doubt. What are we to understand by the fifteenth verse, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I called my son" (Matt. ii: 15). The thing to be understood is, that Christ was an "abomination" (Is. xli: 24); that he was "stubble;" that he was "dust" (Is. xli: 2), in his vile heredity: that he was a brand plucked from the burning as to his claim by birth; and that was what Matthew was seizing upon in the historic allegory. He came out of Egypt, just as all the rest of us come out of the iron furnace. And he was called from Nazareth, not only because Nazareth was an "abomination," but because Christ was the "Branch"* (Is. liii; 2; see Zech. iii: 8; vi: 12), fairly and actually derived from our dead humanity.

We would like to quote other passages. "Agur," an allegorical personage, is himself Christ's humanity;† and he wonders at his own relief,—"Because I am more brutish than a man of the better sort,

* Heb. *Nezer*—a branch.

† See the author's Commentary on Proverbs, pp. 506–509.

and have not the discernment even of a common man, and have not learned wisdom, and yet have the knowledge of holy things: who hath ascended up to heaven and come down" *etc.*, *i. e.*, who has ennobled such a humanity? (see the whole passage), the idea being that the man Christ, by any race-heredity, and by any tie of flesh, is literally "an abomination," and that this would have come out save for the intervention of the Most High; but that from the emigrants out of the iron furnace there was to be raised up one who was to be chosen before all time; who was to be lifted out of the miry pit; who was to be known before he was in the womb; who was to be sanctified before he came forth (Jer. i: 5); and who was to be so tabernacled in by God, as to become God himself; and who was therefore to be worshipped and adored, though but the worm Jacob (Is. xli: 14), and though effecting his triumphs on paths that he could not tread with his feet* (Is. xli: 2).

CHAPTER II.

Christ and Woman.

Of course, if Joseph were the father, no difficulty would occur in Christ as the inheritor of Adam: but, as Mary was the mother, it still remains to prove that that makes the slenderest difference as to a true connection with our humanity.

* This is a peculiar expression, and means that Christ was so verily man that, like the man Elijah, or the man Paul, he could not follow the omnipotence, and actually feel it, and wield it, and tread in the path of it, in his mere humanity. His humanity did not raise the dead; but only his Deity as his humanity willed it.

Notice this,—Woman herself is introduced to us in a careful presentation. She is not brought from a distance, as Christ is supposed to be, but she is bred of Adam. "This is now bone of my bones" (Gen. ii: 23), says our old progenitor. And the Bible seems careful to declare that "she was taken out of man" (ib.). Her very name in Hebrew (*isha*) betokens that (ib.); and the passage seems to delight to declare that the man and wife are "one flesh" (v. 24).

Now Targums are not more fabled and traditionary than our glosses of the text. I have searched everywhere. Men are called seed of man (Gen. xvii: 7) and seed of woman (Gen. iii: 15); and I can trace no difference. Eve seems to have imagined Cain to be the Messiah; and announces him,—"I have gotten possession of the man Jehovah" (Gen. iv: 1). If she had been taught that much, why had she not been taught that in an ordinary birth it was impossible? Tamar! was her blood less contaminating than that of Obed? And Rahab! and Bathsheba! It has often been remarked that Christ was brought nearer to man by the turpitude in some of his mothers. Has all that been folly? And, if so, why? Mary brought to the temple a sacrifice upon the birth of her child. And if "the days of her purification" (Lu. ii: 22) were for herself, why does the word "THEIR purification" linger about the old manuscript? and why, at any rate, in this particular instance *have* a sacrifice, if immaculate purity, even to the extent of their being no heredity from Adam, was to be the conception of the birth?

Why, moreover, had Christ to pay a ransom as the first born?

CHAPTER III.

Christ and Death.

If Christ, though woman-born, was an heir of Adam, and, as Peter expresses it, of the fruit of the loins of David (Acts ii: 30), he is brought squarely under the curse, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." But our attention was first excited by passages far more express than this. And what we wish to notice is the exceeding daintiness with which the inspired writers pick out their words. The subject is, of course, a delicate one. Christ never sinned. And should I select the title, "Christ Lost in Adam," my language would not be as happy as that which corresponds to it in the living word. When Paul says, "In Adam all die" (1 Cor. xv: 22), see how expert he is. He does not make his statement in the past tense, but with singular deftness tells us this,—that, ages after Adam (using the present tense), men who were in no sense in the garden, now "die," temporally and eternally, in consequence of his sin; or, as it is tersely expressed, "in Adam." With like skill are those wonderful passages that I am about to quote. When I say, "Christ Lost in Adam," I instantly have to define. He is not lost, in many important particulars. He was never lost. I mean by that, Christ as God was never lost at all. And Christ as man, when he actually came into being, was already saved. He never saw corruption. *I* was

never lost. That is, if I belong to Christ, I was covenanted for from eternity; and twenty centuries ago I was paid for: so that I need never be finally lost. But Christ was saved in a far more efficient sense. He never sinned. He never tasted actual apostacy. And, therefore if I were to call my book, "Christ Dead in Adam," I should have to show that he never died actually; it would have to be, that he inherited death; nay, that he actually incurred death, as one, by the earlier judgment, with the offending Adam; that he actually feared death, (Heb. v: 7), as we shall most particularly show; that he actually felt death, in an enervated conscience (Mar. xiv: 38; Heb. v: 2), and in the power of a supreme temptation; but that he never succumbed to death, simply because he was redeemed; the Holy Ghost meeting him in the very womb of his mother, and overshadowing him at the very first, and saying to death, "O Death, I will be thy plague," that death having the rights by heritage, and rights that would have been enforced, were it not for the identical ransom which expelled it in the children of his people.

Now, if there are sentences that come out that tell all this, and tell it in the most emphatic way, I beg you to notice how aptly they will tell it, and how the texts I quote tell it at the very first blow; how they frame it in a final shape; and though they provoke you to exclaim, How very strong they are! yet there is no room for wavering. I need not say, They are true in that sense, but not true in the other. But they have all that digested at the first. They have all said at a stroke, without the need of returning limitations.

For example Peter says, "Being put to death in the flesh" (1 Pet. iii: 18).

Now, in our haziness, we shroud this under a trivial translation. We make it refer to the cross. Nobody dreams that this does not mean "put to death," at all.

The verb (*thanatoö*) occurs eleven times in the Greek. It never means slain, or killed, but always, "delivered to death," or "made as good as dead." Paul says, "For thy sake are we killed all the day long" (Rom. viii: 36). Three of the cases refer to religious persecution (Matt. x: 21; Mar. xiii: 12; Lu. xxi: 16); three others to the counsel of the scribes (Matt. xxvi: 59; xxvii: 1; Mar. xiv: 55); each of the six meaning to "cause to be put to death." Of the three that remain, one is the passage, "dead to the law" (Rom. vii: 4); another the expression, "chastened and not killed" (2 Cor. vi: 9); meaning "not delivered over to death:" and the only remaining one is that in Romans: let me read the whole of it;—"If ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body" (Rom. viii: 13); meaning, if ye give them over to die. This now is the skill I speak of. The apostle Peter does not say, Christ was dead; but he says, "Being made a dead man, or as good as dead." This is the exact limit of the purport of my book. Being made a lost man by the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; which may be stated thus—dead naturally, but never allowed to see death,—graciously redeemed in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and born of her, yet without sin: or, returning to the apostolic language,—"A

dead man by the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit:' by which Spirit, we go on to hear, he was not only quickened, but went forth to quicken others. He went into this great "prison" house of earth, and preached to its dead spirits (1 Pet. iv: 6); not always as man, for he was not man always; but to spirits "who at any time (*pote*) were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God has waited in days of Noah," that is, in days like those of Noah, "an ark being a preparing." We are carried too far, however. A glance must be enough for the context.* Returning to the eighteenth verse, we will confirm it by another from the Apostle Paul. But before we do that, let us restate its meaning. It means that Christ was as good as dead according to the flesh; for that an old man would have been born within him by his fleshly nature, and that he would have fallen into sin; but that he was made alive, as a new man, by the work of the Spirit; and that the new man utterly destroyed the old; not its infirmities (Heb. v: 2); not, at all, its peccableness (Heb. v: 7); not, least of all, its tempted nature (Matt. iv: 1); but its actual sinfulness; not as in his glorified state, but by the naked power and overbalancing mastery of the Holy Ghost. This is Peter's testimony.

Now for another apostle.

When Christ was set up from eternity, he was decreed as the head of the universe (Ps. 2). "For him were all things created" (Col. i: 16). He was not created first, but created centrally. All things

* See this whole passage discussed in the Monograph, "Are Souls Immortal?" III. Chap. V.

were created around him; that is, as Paul expresses it, "By him all things consist" (E. V. Col. i: 17). When, therefore, not as God, but as man, he was born into the world, he was "the first born of every creature" (Col. i: 15). How? Not temporally. The morning stars had sung together for millions of ages. Then how was he the first born? Why, logically: in that every thing else was begotten in the very first idea of him. The universe, as a whole, was decreed when Christ was decreed. "For by him;" and, as far as this alludes to the human nature, we must take the copulative meaning of *dia*, as where John says, This is he that came by water and blood: therefore, making this change, and applying it to the man, let us begin again,—"For with him, or by means of him, as the unifying ideal, were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things were created with him and for him; and he is before all things; and in him all things stood together" (Col. i: 16, 17).

Now, using this apt context as a fine setting for the clause which is to be our second in the way of proof, let us bring in that clause at once. It is in the bosom of the next verse. It reads, "The first-born from the dead." Now, how is he the first born? John repeats the sentence—"The first begotten of the dead" (E. V., Rev. i: 5). The Greek is the same. Had not Lazarus been raised from the dead? How singularly we lose Scriptures by trivial interpretations! Who would look at these pregnant utterances, and

say, they were thoroughly satisfied by the idea that, in the order of time, Christ was the first to break the bands of the grave? But if not, then where are our ideas carried? Precisely where Peter's were (1 Pet. 3: 18). Christ, before all time, was decreed in Adam. When time began he "fell with" Adam; at least if that be a proper phrase in our "Confession" to apply to all mankind. Through the flight of ages, till he came, he lay with Adam; and when he came, he was heir of Adam. As heir he would have been cursed in Adam, but for being redeemed. Though redeemed he *was* cursed in Adam, by being born infirm (Heb. v: 2). He was "begotten from the dead," just as you have been, or I have been, by the Holy Ghost. And he was the "first begotten"; not that he was regenerated before Job, or before Abel, or Abraham; but that, as cause, he must be logically first; that is, the new birth of Abel must be granted on account of the new birth of Christ; and the new birth of Christ, though four thousand years after, must precede in court, that is in the plan and concession of the verdict, the new birth of Abel, because the new birth of Christ was necessary to that absolute obedience without which he could not have won the new birth of all his people.

We speak of new birth, but it must be with unspeakable distinctions. The new birth of Christ was not like yours or mine. It had no old birth behind it. He was never born at all, till he was born sinless. He never saw corruption. He was born infirm and tempted, but he resisted perfectly, as our new birth resists only partially. He was born Emmanuel; and

the presence of the Godhead curbed by main strength the forces of iniquity. It was done with human struggle, like ours or yours. But while we succeed partially in this prison-house of clay, he succeeded perfectly; though in terrible torment. And his birth into this fierce battle in which he lost never a field, was his begetting; and it was as "First Begotten," because it had to come first to him in the order of logic as the means and the purchase of the begetting of his people.

Of a piece with these views are many expressions in the prophets. He is called "elect" (Is. xlii: 1). Elect from among whom? He is called a "Branch" (Zech. iii: 8). A branch from whom? He is called an "abomination" (Is. xli: 24). An abomination why? And then, in broader terms, he is called "a rod out of the stem of Jesse" (Is. xi: 1) and "a root out of a dry ground" (Is liii: 2). He is said to "grow up from beneath" (Zech. vi: 12; see the Heb.) There is the command, "Write in it with a pen,—*Enosh* (that is, the sick, the mortal, the incurable one: it is the lowest name for man) shall hasten the spoil, and hurry the prey" (Is. viii: 1). He says himself, The Lord hath formed me from the womb (Is. xlix: 5): The Lord God hath opened mine ear (l: 5). We count this passage in Isaiah as throughout a testimony to our poor sin-visited Redeemer.

Of a like character is much in the Psalms of David. "I will praise thee, for thou hast heard me, and art become my salvation" (Ps. cxviii: 21). "The sorrows of death compassed me, and the pains of hell gat hold upon me: I found trouble and sorrow. Then

called I upon the name of the Lord: O Lord, I beseech thee, deliver my soul" (Ps. cxvi: 3, 4). "Thou hast delivered my soul from death, mine eyes from tears, and my feet from falling" (ib. v. 8). "Thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest hell" (Ps. lxxxvi: 13). When it begins to speak of "iniquities" and "sins" and "transgressions," the translators shrink away at once: but when we remember that the Bible uses the word "sin" oftentimes for being treated as a sinner, we are driven from none of the Messianic passages. And yet we are not driven quite over to the idea of mere atoning guiltiness. Judah said, "If I bring him not unto thee, then I have sinned against thee forever" (Gen. xliii: 9; see also 1 Ki. i: 21). So that when David said, "Heal my soul, for I have sinned against thee" (Ps. xli: 4); or when he says, "Mine iniquities are gone over mine head; as an heavy burden they are too heavy for me" (Ps. xxxviii: 4); or when he says, "there is no soundness in my flesh, because of thine anger; neither is there any rest in my bones, because of my sin" (ib. v. 3),—we are not to be driven to dislocate the Psalms, and to separate Messianic and un-Messianic parts of the same brief poem; nor on the other hand are we to think of a mere vicarious guiltiness; but we are to think of the guilt, *i. e.*, in Oriental phrase, the sin, that lies closer than a mere assumption; the guilt that would have been inherited from Adam; the sin that lay menacing from the first moment of birth; the guilt that was of Christ himself, except as kept off by sacrifice; and the sin that lay natural to the heart, and was kept couching for its prey, and would

have burst in upon Christ, were it not for the supernatural work of the directly purchased, because graciously imparted, agency, that had been promised, of the Holy Ghost.

Now we are going on to other chapters. But let it be here distinctly intimated,—All the other chapters will be proofs of this one. For example, we are to show in the next (Chap. IV.) that Christ was quickened, and that that quickening was often spoken of under the phrase, "resurrection from the dead"; in the next, that he was quickened by the Spirit (Chap. V.); in the next, that he was ransomed (Chap. VI.); then, that he was justified (Chap. VII.), adopted (Chap. VIII.), and sanctified (Chap. IX.); then, that he was the subject of humiliating ordinances, baptism and circumcision (Chap. X.); then, that he was glorified (Chap. XI.); then, *how* he was Jehovah (Chap. XII.); in all which chapters one truth will appear, viz., that he was lost in Adam; the influence of each being to cut off the possibility of mistake, and to show, in his quickening and sanctification, *how* he was lost, and how the death of which I have been speaking, though it never occurred, was kept from occurring, simply as our perdition is, by a divine atonement.

CHAPTER IV.

Christ and Life.

Paul, in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians, tells those Ephesian Christians that they were "quickened together with Christ." There is

no flinching from the expression. Let us quote it fully. "God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ (by grace ye are saved); and hath raised us up together" (Eph. ii: 4–6). The phrase is direct: "hath co-quickened us": and lest any one should say, "hath co-quickened us *by* Christ," Paul repeats the sentence in the Epistle to the Colossians, and there prevents such a use of the dative by the actual preposition (*sun*). Let me quote here that also,—"Buried with him in baptism; wherein also ye are co-risen, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins, and the uncircumcision of your flesh, HATH HE QUICKENED TOGETHER WITH HIM, having forgiven you all trespasses" (Col. iii: 12, 13).

I beg you to notice how your mind, clinging to old thoughts, puts some gloss upon the passage, that will parry its more natural consequence. "Hath quickened us together with Christ." Of course our quickening, and Christ's quickening, must be, at various points, different; because Christ's death, and our death, are different. Christ's death was never reached. He never died spiritually. But hence is best explained this quickening. He was quickened from the very womb. We are quickened not till we are converted. We are quickened only in part. We are quickened chiefly at the resurrection. We are born dead. But Christ was born fully into life; and, therefore, we must mark a great difference there between him and his people. And yet he was born

from the dead (*ek nekrôn*). And he was born in view of a ransom. And he was born of the Holy Spirit. He would have been dead by the flesh, but he was "quickened by the Spirit" (1 Pet. iii: 18). He was like his people, therefore, in many respects; but he differed in these two,—first, he was born perfect, and born without any interval of sin; and, second, he was saved by himself. We are quickened together with Christ, but we are quickened by a purchased Spirit; and the difference between that quickening and his, is that he bought for both of us. His glorious Deity was the foundation of a price which his hard-wrought obedience paid down "for himself and for the errors of the people."

Let us pursue this subject further. "God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things in earth and things under the earth" (Phil. ii: 9, 10). And, yet, he delights to throw himself with his people. Nicodemus says to him, "We know that thou art a teacher come from God" (Jo. iii: 2). He immediately replies, "If ANY MAN be not begotten from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God" (v. 3). The forms of such teaching are endless. "The first born from the dead": that we have already noticed. And Paul repeats the idea; taking it away from the thought of the resurrection altogether, where he says, "That he might be the first born among many brethren" (Rom. viii: 29).

Moreover, in respect to the resurrection; are we not quite at fault in making that the mere resurrec-

tion of the body? Notice certain passages. "I am the resurrection and the life" (Jo. xi: 25). Does that mean the merely fleshly resurrection? Again, "And preached through Jesus the resurrection from the dead" (Acts iv: 2). This form of summing up occurs continually. "For which hope's sake, King Agrippa" (Acts xxvi: 7);—and when we come to understand the apostle's "hope," it is, "that there shall be a resurrection of the dead." "That I may know the power of his resurrection" (Phil. iii: 10). "Even baptism doth now save us, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. iii: 21). Again, "His Son whom he raised from the dead" (1 Thess. i: 10). Again, "Remember that Jesus Christ was raised from the dead according to my gospel" (2 Tim. ii: 8). Again. "Determined (*marg.*) to be the Son of God by the resurrection from the dead" (Rom. i: 4).

Now I say, Lazarus's resurrection, or Eutychus's, or Jairus's daughter's, or the Shunamite's son's, are no more the boundary of these resurrections which are the "hope" (Acts xxvi: 7) of the saints, than the grave is the boundary of the dominion of wickedness.

Yet if they are not, what do they refer to in Christ?

All men have noticed this; some with more wakefulness than others. And yet it has not dislodged the indolent impression, that Christ's resurrection was merely from the grave; yet every body agrees that there is a strange insisting upon this, considering the other events more central in his history.

Now, we believe that Christ's resurrection often

means his resurrection from his death in Adam. "If ye then be risen with Christ" (Col. iii: 1). Does that mean from the grave? Let us quote many passages. "God hath fulfilled the same, in that he hath raised up Jesus again" (Acts xiii: 33). Does that mean corporeally? No: for it immediately adds, "This day have I begotten thee." Some, therefore, have thought that the begetting of Emmanuel was at his resurrection (Sanctius, Camero., Cor. à Lapide; see also Poli Syn.). Why not rather that his resurrection was at his begetting? Our doctrine is, that Jesus was raised from the dead in the womb of the Virgin Mary. That is, that he descended to her lineally apostate, and that he was born of her, not wicked, because he was saved, and not guilty, because he was redeemed, and that that was his *anastasis*, and that all the other facts of it, viz., his bursting from the grave, and his *anastasis* into glory, are all a part of what, in many passages, are regarded as his rising from the dead (*ek nekrôn*).

And here let me say, that Christ's bursting from the grave is more than we usually make of it. He was born *enosh* (Is. viii: 1), that is, a mortal; and that means more than a mere sick body: it means a sick mind. Sin belonged to him by certain tendencies of his nature; and he was held up from sinning by the sheer power of the Holy Ghost. Hence his temptation. Hear his account in the Garden: "The Spirit truly is willing, but the flesh is weak" (Matt. xxvi: 41). When, therefore, he died upon the cross, he shut his eye to the great period of death, and finished it; and did so in a great acme of tempted

agony. That is the meaning, in my belief, of his cry, *Lama sabacthani?* God *did* leave him, till he was pushed nigh to sin. And this is the meaning of those strong words of revelation, "With strong crying and tears to him that was able to save him from death" (Heb. v: 7). Paul alludes to it, "Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin" (Heb. xii: 4). And, therefore, the bursting of the grave was a new epoch. His soul came out to a relief. And, therefore, the resurrection often touches this part of the *anastasis;* and even the mouldering of the body becomes a symbol of the apostacy that Christ escaped.

Hence it is that even the *grave*-deliverance is so much insisted on. "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hades; neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption." This is constantly repeated (Ps. xvi: 10, Acts ii: 27; xiii: 35). It is insisted on in cases where the theme is spiritual (Acts xiii: 34). It is illustrated by the case of David (Acts xiii: 36). And his silent sleeping, which Paul announces as still subsisting at Jerusalem, is made to glorify the difference of a perfected and ascended Emmanuel (v. 37).

Some of these passages we must husband. And yet we may be too fearful of a necessary and sufficiently important repetition. Why should we not quote often where there are different lights? Notice this,—"Now the God of peace that brought again from the dead (*anagagôn ek nekrôn*) our Lord Jesus, THROUGH THE BLOOD OF THE EVERLASTING COVENANT" (Heb. xiii: 20),—our exact doctrine. Again, "Buried with him by baptism into death; that, like

as Christ was raised up from the dead (*ek nekrôn*) BY THE GLORY OF THE FATHER, even so we also should walk in newness of life" (Rom. vi: 4). "Raised from the dead"—How? Why, to "walk" differently from the way he would have walked if he had been given up to death. That is the very weight of the passage. Further; "That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection." What power was there in his resurrection? If he beat back *death*, I can see that his perfect obedience and his entire sanctification would have great power in it. But what power was there in Lazarus' walking out of the grave? But notice further;—"That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death"; and now, strongest of all, the *object* of this wonderful "power,"—"if by any means *I* might attain to the resurrection of the dead" (Phil. iii: 10, 11). Does that mean the mere resurrection of the body? Why, all will have that. Now, notice again,—"That he should be the first to rise from the dead" (Acts xxvi: 23). "The eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, and what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, ACCORDING TO THE WORKING OF HIS MIGHTY POWER" (that is, not like it, but "according to" it), "which he wrought in Christ when" —What? when he revivified his dust? Oh surely no! "Which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead" (Eph. i; 18–20), that is "enlightened" his "understanding"

and lifted his nature, and raised him, as, more slowly, he raises *us*, from the grave of sin, and from the ruin of a spiritual apostacy. Look further; "If we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again FOR OUR JUSTIFICATION" (Rom. iv: 24, 25).

Now, we do not deny that some raisings of Christ refer to the tomb (1 Cor. xv: 4); and that some are of a mixed character, strongly colored by the language of the sepulchre (1 Cor. vi: 14; Eph. i: 20). But we do deny that some refer to the tomb at all (Acts iii: 26; Rom. vi: 4; Eph. ii: 6); and we do aver that the main *anastasis* of Christ, which is the great hinge-point of all the Testament, is his *anastasis* from death, viz., that spiritual death, which he inherited, like you or me, from his first parents.

This will shock us less as we proceed in the investigation.

CHAPTER V.

Christ and the Spirit.

IF the *anastasis* of Christ mean often his entire quickening, then it is interesting to see who the agent is; for it brings him nearer to us, to find that the agent to save, is the same blessed Spirit that changes the heart of all his people.

We might suppose it would be his Deity. And so it is indeed. But we would suppose it would be expressed that way; that is, God being incarnate,

we would suppose that He would enter into the man, and that we would hear no more of death or weakness. But how infinitely far it is from that! God enters Emmanuel with much of the same language with which he enters his people. Indeed, the very account of his begetting is all of that character. "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God" (Lu. i: 35) We may throw, therefore, all the great processes in the life of our Saviour into one, and consider them together; first, his begetting; second, his anointing; third, his raising from the dead. And we may consider the agent the same. It was indeed his Deity. But the Bible delights to talk of it as the same agency that is in us; and, therefore, God, and the Father, and the Spirit, are all talked of as saving Christ; that is, as raising him from the dead.

1. In the first place, "God." Let me quote several passages. "We also are weak with him, but we shall live with him by the power of God" (2 Cor. xiii: 4). Listen in Jeremiah,—"Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee; and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nation" (Jer. i: 5). Isaiah;—"The Lord hath called me from the womb; from the bowels of my mother hath he made mention of my name" (Is. xlix: 1). He hath "formed me from the womb to be his servant" (v. 5). "In an acceptable time have I heard thee; and in a day of salvation have I helped thee" (v. 8). This is his beget-

ting (Rev. i: 5); his anointing (Is. lxi: 1); his rising from the dead (Rom. i: 4); his perfect sanctification (Heb. vii: 26). David uses all this language. "Thou art my son," God is represented as saying; "this day have I begotten thee" (Ps. ii: 7). "Mine ears hast thou bored," says another Psalm (Ps. xl: 6). One was just as much in the village of Nazareth as the other. And Isaiah repeats the language, "The Lord God hath opened my ear, and I was not rebellious" (Is. l: 5); the boring of the ear being just as much effectual calling, as the opening of *our* ears; and Christ seems to think it when he says, "Say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, thou blasphemest, because I said I am the son of God?" (Jo. x: 36).

And under the term, resurrection:—"Wherein also ye are risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead" (Col. ii: 12). "Him that raised up Jesus" (Ro. iv: 24). "Believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead" (Ro. x: 6). "He that raised up the Lord Jesus" (2 Cor. iv: 14). "Which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead" (Eph. i: 20). This is soul-raising as of the regenerate sinner. For it is impossible to array these *anastasis* passages, and say, They mean the body. And if they transcend the body, then they mean the soul. And if they mean the soul, then they mean more than the soul at the last day. And if they mean more than at the last day, then they mean spiritual life. And if they refer to spiritual life, then it is a resurrection from spiritual death. And if it is

so with man, then it is so with Christ. "We are quickened together with him" (Col. ii: 13). And if it is so with Christ, then the passages are complete which show that it is by the same agent. Christ, though Incarnate God, yet, as man, was "as good as dead" (1 Peter iii: 18), and the agent to save him was the same blessed God that quickens into life the grace of the meanest of his people.

2. Second, the "Father." There is no scruple that must always speak of "the Spirit." Christ says boldly, "I live by the Father" (Jo. vi: 57). Paul speaks of conversion as being *sealed.* "Who hath sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit" (2 Cor. i: 22). We are to have a *hegira* from one world to another, and the package is "sealed," so to speak, that our title may survive the journey. "Ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise" (Eph. i: 13). "Grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption" (Eph. iv: 30). Neglecting to speak of the Spirit, and announcing the agent as his "Father," Christ not only speaks, by the Apostle, of "God the Father, who raised him from the dead" (Gal. i: 1); and not only says that the Father hath sanctified him, and sent him into the world (Jo. x: 36),—but he fixes upon this thought of *sealing.* He says we may count on him for eternal life, because he is to be "sealed," and sent across the ages:—"Labor not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you; for him hath God the Father sealed" (Jo. vi: 27).

3. Thirdly, "the Holy Ghost." And, under the name of this agency, the Bible seems to delight to include Christ under the soteriology of his people. He is sanctified by the Spirit (Acts x: 38). He is quickened by the Spirit (Eph. ii: 5). He is raised again by the Spirit (Rom. viii: 11). He speaks by the Spirit; "for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him" (Jo. iii: 34). So, he lives by the Spirit (1 Pet. iii: 18); and is "justified in the Spirit" (1 Tim. iii: 16); and is "born of the Holy Ghost" (Lu. i: 35). There seems to be no point of mercy by the Spirit in which he does not claim a brother's share, though our Incarnate Redeemer.

And, therefore, we may multiply instances to almost any extent;—"The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me" (Is. lxi: 1). "I have put my Spirit upon him" (Is. xlii: 1). "The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him" (Is. xi: 2). And even the higher notions of Messiahship, and of being divinely begotten, and of spectacular adoption, as where the Spirit descends in the likeness of a dove, and abides upon him,—all this, the divine inspiration seems to take pains to associate with the history of his people.

Is he begotten? So are we: and he takes pains to tell an inquirer that, just at the first blush of his adoration. "We know that thou art a teacher come from God." Aye, but said the blessed Redeemer, If *any man*, verily I say unto you, is not begotten from above, he cannot see the Kingdom of God (Jo. iii: 3). And so Christ, or, in the Hebrew language, the Messiah, is not a name so separated from us that we do

not borrow it. We also are *Christ, i. e.*, "anointed" (2 Cor. i: 21); and the very same word, kept from us as no ineffable speech, is applied to us again and again, and in the same sense of sanctifying (1 Jo. ii: 27), in both the Testaments (Ps. cv: 15). The scene at the baptism (Matt. iii: 16) is not to be made peculiar (Acts ii: 3); and though the Divine Son as God, is utterly out of our vision (1 Tim. i: 17); and though the Divine Son as man, because he is God, is lifted far above principality and power (Eph. i: 21); and though we are to worship him, and to trust our souls to him, and to recognize him as altogether above us, both now and at all times, yet as man distinctly in his own nature, born of Adam, and heiring from him eternal death, we never shall be simple till we get down to the literalness of his actual curse; "Anointed with the Holy Ghost" (Acts x: 38); enabled only by the Holy Spirit to offer himself without spot to God (Heb. ix: 14); his mother "with child of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. i: 18); his battle made possible by the Holy Spirit descending and resting upon him (Jo. i: 33); and the meaning of all this being, that without all this he would have been born a sinner; that as *Jesus* his Godhead was his helper*; but that as *Christ* he had to be striven with like you or me; only with enough of the anointing to make his sinlessness complete, though desperately wrestled for under the agonies of inconceivable temptation.

* "Jehovah, the Help."

CHAPTER VI.

Christ and Ransom.

If Jesus Christ was guilty in such a sense as that, if born unransomed, he must, under the old heredity, have been heir of sin and death, we must expect to find passages that speak of his redemption. We have found passages that speak of him as *thanatoumenos* (Chap. III); and we have found passages that speak of him as quickened (Chap. IV); and the Bible delights to associate these things with man, and to make the deadness and the quickening just exactly that in his humanity that might be expected under the curse of Adam. Now, if to be born doomed and quickened, he must, in an important sense, not be born doomed, but be quickened *a parte ante:* and to be thus thoroughly saved, he must be redeemed like Job or Daniel; that is, as an anticipative result of a redemption not yet wrought out for himself and for his people. Now, announcements of this were that which first roused our attention to these unconsidered facts in the life of our Redeemer.

For example, Zechariah;—"Behold thy King cometh unto thee; he is just and having salvation" (Zech. ix: 9). We glanced at the margin, and there was the tell-tale rendering,—"He is just, and saving himself"; and we looked at the Hebrew, and there came out the plain passive, "A SAVED ONE." And even that was not all the intimation; for there is a pronoun introduced. Our version strives to give it

by translating it,—"He is just and having salvation"; instead of simply saying,—"Thy king, just and having salvation." But every body knows that the expressed pronoun is emphatic. The sentence, therefore, is singularly ripe. "Thy King cometh, righteous, and himself a saved one"; marking as you see, with extreme exactness, first, that he was quickened, and, second, that he was redeemed,—a fact noteworthy enough to introduce the pronoun; for being a great lordly deliverer himself, it was the more remarkable that he should be "himself a saved one."

Now, where better bring in the testimony of Paul? We will bring it first from the Hebrews. Everybody knows that the high priest was a type of our Saviour. Three times Paul says that he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people. He actually applies it to Christ. He says, in the fifth chapter (vs. 1–3),—"For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins: who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way, FOR THAT HE HIMSELF ALSO IS COMPASSED WITH INFIRMITY. And, by reason hereof, he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins." Listen again, "Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; for this he did once, when he offered up himself"* (Heb. vii: 27). Again, "Into the second

* Commentators have been unguarded enough to infer that he did "not need" to offer for himself; but a glance at the passage will show that the "not needing" refers to the offering more than "once."

went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which "he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people" (Heb. ix: 7). And, now, to this last instance, which, beyond all peradventure, shows that this expression "for himself" was painstakingly intended, is affixed another sentence explanatory of this last, and which, though tampered with like the passage in Zechariah,* is all the more on that account striking when uncovered of its translation. Let us go back. "But into the second went the high priest alone, once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself and for the errors of the people. . . . But Christ being come, an high priest of good things to come by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having OBTAINED ETERNAL REDEMPTION (for us." E. V.†)

What are we to think of this addition?

Why, we are to think this about it. We have called it "tampering." We mean *quoad* the effect, not *quoad* the mind of the translator. The effect is sad. It shrouds the Spirit. But the mind of the translator was simply empty of the thought. The "*for us*" was added, as we say, to make sense. And the beautiful doctrine that Jesus Christ was a man, bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, and, as a man, heired from Adam, as well as heired from the throne of heaven, had never entered their belief; and

* "Righteous, and himself a saved one" (Zech. ix: 9).

† No such Greek in the original.

therefore, that the Adam-side of their Saviour had to be redeemed, was not a thing in waiting, and did not rise to claim its texts, when sentences, plainly asserting it, were actually struggling in the translators' minds.

But let us proceed. I will not pause upon the Messianic passages. The words "save" (Ps. xxii: 21; xl: 2; lxxix: 1; Is. xlix: 8; Heb. v: 7), and "redeem" (Ps. xxxi: 5; lxix: 18; Heb. ix: 12), and "deliver" (Ps. xl: 13, 17; lxix: 14, 15), bear singular relations in respect to the Redeemer. I will not dwell upon the sentence, "Heal my soul, for I have sinned against thee" (Ps. xli: 4; see Chap. III. p. 42). I will not expound this passage,—"I will praise thee; for thou hast heard me, and art become my salvation" (Ps. cxviii: 21); nor this, "Brought from the dead (*anagagôn ek nekrôn*) our Lord Jesus, through the blood of the everlasting covenant" (Heb. xiii: 20); for though this last sentence distinctly teaches Christ's quickening (Col. ii: 13) as having been purchased, yet perhaps mere quotation will be enough, and we may not load the propounding of a faith too much with lengthened comments.

Passing by all this; and not noticing, either, "Jesus," *Jehovah His Helper* (Matt. i: 21), which is the sense casual commentators give the name, who have no thought of our doctrine,—I hurry on to the Prophet Zechariah, and to one scene in his book which wonderfully supports all that has been said.

It was the scene with Joshua.

Joshua was the reigning high priest. Joshua is distinctly announced as the type of the Messiah.

Not only has he His chosen name, but, when he

is exhibited on the stage, he is called a "sign" (Zech. iii: 8, see *marg.*), and he is distinctly told, when he is brought out in state with gold on his head "Behold the man whose name is the BRANCH" (Zech. vi: 12, also iii: 8).

Not only so, but the angel of the covenant is also present. It seems to be a passage where the Godhead and the manhood of Christ are both impersonated (see Jo. iii: 13): and where the Godhead orders the relief (Zech. iii: 4), and the manhood receives it. Let me quote the sentences. "And he showed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him. And the Lord said unto Satan, The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan; even the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem, rebuke thee: is not this a brand plucked out of the fire? Now Joshua was clothed with filthy garments, and stood before the angel" (Zech. iii: 1–3).

Now examine the poetry thoroughly. Who is the angel? All say, Christ the God. And who is Joshua the high priest? By the evidence of the context (Zech. vi: 11, 12), Christ the man. And why is the prophet so negligent? Why does he speak sometimes of the angel (iii: 1, 6), and sometimes, as though it made no difference, of the Great Jehovah? Because it makes no difference. Sometimes the angel speaks (iii: 6), and sometimes Jehovah; (iii: 2) and other passages are negligent in the same way (Gen. xviii: 2, 13, 14); and the meaning is that the angel *is* * Jehovah; that is, that the God-

* I mean, significantly; even though he be a common angel.

head part of Christ is God Almighty. And why is Joshua weak? and why does Satan stand at his right hand? and how can he resist him, *i. e.*, play Satan (Heb.) to him, and act the adversary (*marg.*)? Because he is *enosh;* that is, mortal, temptable. This is the reason for what immediately follows. He is not only called the Branch * (iii: 8); he is not only said to grow up from beneath (*mitahath*, vi: 12); he is not only said to be "a root out of a dry ground" (Is. liii: 2); but it is boldly said, "Is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?" (Zech. iii: 2). Moreover Joshua is said to be "clothed with filthy garments;" and the angel, that is, his Godhead, stands and sees the filthy garments taken away, and that he be clothed with a change of raiment (iii: 3–5).

Consider all this in the simplest style of exegesis, and in the light of other passages where he is called "an abomination" (Is. xli: 24); where he is called "dust" and "stubble"; where he is said to be "a saved one"; and where he is said to be kept from death (Heb. v: 7); and where he is said to obtain eternal redemption (Heb. ix: 12); and what can it mean but that, forensically, he was "plucked out of the fire"; and that, by right of blood, he was "filthy"; and that, by the hand of his Godhead, he was delivered; working out his own relief; setting "a fair mitre on his head"; and causing his iniquity (forensically meant, see Chap. III. p. 42) to pass from him; and clothing him with other garments? (Zech. iii: 1–5.)

He is treated with terms, too, as though he were

* Equivalent to our word *sprout or sucker:* meaning a young tree out of an old root.

a mere probationer. "If thou wilt walk in my ways, and if thou wilt keep my keeping, then thou shalt also judge my house, and shalt also keep my courts; and I will give thee companions among them that stand by" (Zech. iii: 7).

And this leads me to speak more fully of these conditions. First, the need of them! We have shown passages that rate him dead (1 Pet. iii: 18), and we have shown passages that bespeak him quickened (Eph. ii: 5), and now we have presented some that call him ransomed. Of course there must have been a ransom; and it is time to speak of that, and show what was the substance of the price laid down for the delivery of the Emmanuel. Now, the Godhead part we have already noticed. He was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father" (Rom. vi: 4). That is, the dignity of the God gave price to the payments of the man; and thus the angel of the covenant caused the filthy garments to pass away.

But what were the payments of the man?

I think I will satisfy multitudes by saying, They were two things, suffering and obedience; and these things are more striking when we weave them together. Christ made his ransom out of two things, suffering and obedience, and these two may be woven into one. He made his ransom out of a suffering obedience, or an obedient suffering; an offering "without spot to God" (Heb. ix: 14), or an obedience even unto death (Phil. ii: 8). Most people will accept this as their own ransom; and we propound it as the same with the Redeemer.

Now, what obedience? Most people impair the

obedience of Christ by making it too easy. They make him God, and then, moreover, they make him not accursed man. They make him free of Adam. And therefore, if he suffer, I mean if he suffer in his obedience, they have to make it in some mysterious way. It is "the hidings of God's face." What does that mean? Or it is temptation. But the ordinary account of temptation is strangely mystic. One would think Christ a child, and, with ample knowledge of why God hid his face, to be, so to speak, voluntarily deceived by it; the whole being a house of cards which we dare hardly breathe upon, lest by any even child's question our blessed Saviour should seem even less sensible than the very thieves that suffered by his side. But Oh! if he was accursed; that is, if he had a shattered nature inherited from Adam; if it was fleshly (Rom. viii: 3); and would have fallen into sin, but for the sheer Spirit; if his life, therefore, was by God, and his death would have been by the flesh; then his obedience was a splendid triumph. We have but to imagine a supply of the Spirit barely sufficient sometimes to secure him victory (Matt. xxvii: 46), to understand what temptation meant; what obedience in those fearful circumstances denoted; what its merit was, and what its triumph was in fighting our battle; and why the apostle should say with so much sturdy emphasis, "Humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore," (surely not because he agreed to die as Peter did)—but "Wherefore," because of his most singular and hard-fought obedience, "God also hath

highly exalted him, and given him a name" *etc.* (Phil. ii: 8, 9).

Now the suffering—what was that? We have spoken of the suffering obedience: what was the obedient suffering? And our answer promptly is, Temptation. We come at once to a full and satisfactory account.

Pain of body! Who ever dreams of that? Pain of mind! Yes, but what sort of pain of mind? Pain of guilt? How? and how administered? "Hiding" of Jehovah? In what way? Nay, with what possible result, if Jesus knew from the beginning that it was not a deserved frown, and was part of a splendid self-sacrifice? Why must we be so card-building in our systems? Rationally, what was it? Do you say it was a mystery? That is surely a better answer than the rest; but why make it? If Paul says, "Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin" (Heb. xii: 4), and that points back to many a scene where we can fancy the "great drops of blood falling down to the ground:" if, in those very moments, He exclaims, "The Spirit truly is willing, but the flesh is weak" (Matt. xxvi: 41): if, in prophecy, he cries out, "In the day of my trouble I sought the Lord: my hand was stretched out through the night, and never ceased: my soul refused to be comforted. I remembered God and was troubled: I complained, and my spirit was overwhelmed" (Ps. lxxvii: 2, 3): if he cries, just like a common person, "Will the Lord cast off forever? and will he be favorable no more? Is his mercy clean gone forever? does his promise fail forever more? Hath God for-

gotten to be gracious? hath he in anger shut up his tender mercies?" (ib. vs. 7–9); if he break forth thus, and then Luke tells us he was tempted (Lu. iv: 2), and gives us to understand afterward that he was most horribly tempted (Lu. xxii: 40–43); and Paul discourses upon it thus, "Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared." (Heb. v: 7)—I say, when all this is absolutely volunteered in the word of God, why should we draw back? and I may say further,—Why should we draw back from a guilty Saviour, I mean, guilty in Adam? and from a fleshly Saviour, I mean inheriting from Adam? when he is said to be a tempted Saviour (Heb. iv: 15), and when he seems to have been a ransomed Saviour (Heb. ix: 12), when we are distinctly told he was a quickened Saviour (Eph. ii: 5); and why should we not think his temptation was his suffering, and his resistance was his obedience, and that the battle of it was his merit, and that the fierce throes of this battle was the substance of his expiation, and that his expiation, as Paul declares, was "for himself and for the errors of the people"? (Heb. ix: 7).

This really seems to be a consistent and not derogatory judgment of faith.

And it agrees with many incidental glimpses.

Jesus Christ was to trample Satan, but, in trampling, was to "bruise His heel" (Gen. iii: 15). It was to be a precarious, dangerous, and, to our poor Lord, a hesitating victory. And so Isaiah speaks of

it; and shows how near he was to defeat: and honors the Combatant for persevering, and nursing the mere spark of hope, till he had received the victory. "A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench; he shall bring forth judgment unto victory" (Is. xlii: 3). He shall nurse his own graces. "He shall not fail nor be discouraged till he have set judgment in the earth: and the isles," lost without that "judgment," that is without that favorable verdict won by his expiation, may be looked upon as "waiting" while it hung in suspense (Is. xlii: 4), and shouting over the coming of deliverance (Is. xlii: 11).

Now, another incident. Our blessed Lord, all through his history, must have been the victim of a temptation so grinding as this,—that, through childhood and youth, he must have been waited upon by sin, and watched for as for a single trespass. Where had he a chance to grow, physically? Old views about that are probably all wrong. He was fiercely assaulted sometimes; and, in view of the fact perhaps that physical life could not have endured it oftener, he had his great trial seasons. One was in the Garden. We have already said that the worst seems to have been the very last (Matt. xxvii: 46); and that death came to his relief when he was pushed off to the very verge of his power to endure.* Now, how

* When he cried, Eli, Eli, lama sabacthani? (Matt. xxvii: 46). If, in that last moment, he had wavered and sinned, all would have been lost. You may say, He could not have sinned. Neither can the elect, to the extent of final apostasy. But they can in a very intelligible sense. And it was only by "travail of soul" (Is. liii: 11)

could he grow under this pressure as a child? It has been, therefore, with extreme impression that we have watched the tokens in the Bible that our Saviour did not grow in strength and beauty. The Psalter says, "I may tell all my bones: they look and stare at me" (Ps. xxii: 17). Some of these old crucifixes, cut in ivory, would be the more authentic handling. "My days are consumed like smoke, and my bones are burned as an hearth. My heart is smitten like grass; so that I forget to eat my bread. By reason of the voice of my groaning, my bones cleave to my skin. I am like a pelican of the wilderness; I am like an owl of the desert. My days are like a shadow that declineth; and I am withered like grass" (Ps. cii: 3–6, 11). It may be said, This is all spiritual; and I confess it might be. Show me the Word all full of pictures of Christ in rosy youth, and of our Saviour in vigorous and glorious manhood, and I will give these texts up. For even if they were spiritual, like many other spiritual intimations they may have their *basis* in history and in fact. Show me any ground to think that Christ is to be painted in physical strength, and I will give up all my notion. But if it is the gloss of the painter; if glorious art encircles the Saviour with radiance; if he was a man of sorrow; if he was so haunted by sin that he had no time to grow, and so pressed by responsibility lest, as Solomon expresses it, he should destroy a race of Kings * (Prov. xxxi: 3); if flesh

that Christ was able to say, It is finished; and to reach the end, and safely give up the ghost.

* See Author's Commentary *in loco.*

and blood could not thrive under such a weight, except by miracle, and we have no testimony of such a miracle, and, indeed, all the oposite; if our Saviour, as a man, was a common man (Matt. xiii: 55; Prov. xxx: 2), and, as he seems to declare, "a less" man than John, whom he bears testimony to as the greatest born of women (Matt. xi: 11);* and if there is positively not one Scripture that bears any testimony to Christ's physical strength and comeliness, then we may quietly finish our quotations. and quietly show, what has delighted us, and surprised us not a little, —that the earliest Fathers of the Church bear this very testimony to the stature and to the looks of Jesus.

Isaiah says "He hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him. He is despised and rejected of men" (Is. liii: 2, 3): and I go so far as to say, that if he had the superb appearance that we think of, his villagers would have been more proud of him (Lu. iv: 29). "His visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men" (Is. lii: 14). And when they said to him at Jerusalem, "Thou art not yet fifty years old" (Jo. viii: 57), I believe there stood before them a man battered and worn, broken by the assaults of Satan, with the sweetness of grace breaking out upon his lips (Ps. xlv: 2), and upon his eye (Cant. v: 16), but with a

* This I confess is a new comment, but *mikroteros* never means "*least*," and if it did, there is no meaning in the sentence. I know nothing to forbid the thought that Christ was lesser in mind and in natural talent and force than the child of a priest.

feeble port, despised by the Roman soldiers * (Matt. xxvii; 27–29), laughed at in the palace of Herod (Lu. xxiii: 11), and looking, with his withered face (Is. liii: 2), as though he had borne the buffetings of near "fifty years" (Ps. xxii: 17).

Now, the Fathers! Let me *press the question*, Where did we get our notion of Christ as strong and beautiful?

"His beauty, says Clemens of Alexandria, was in his soul and in his actions; but in appearance he was base. Justin Martyr declares him as being without beauty, without glory, without honor. His body, says Tertullian, had no human handsomeness, much less any celestial splendor. The heathen Celsus, as we learn from Origen, even argued from his traditional meanness and ugliness of aspect as a ground for rejecting his divine origin." †

Enough on this. We reject it as a regular proof, but suggest it as a beautiful illustration: that though God could have made Christ what he pleased, yet he did not make him physically beautiful; and that, if an heir of Adam, and having to fight from his earliest infancy sin and guilt, it would be natural for one daily haunted by temptation, to keep weak under it; daily bringing heaven and all the saints into the risk, to wither under the sacrifice; daily ruined if he sinned BUT ONCE; and daily racked to commit some sin of thought or action, and daily deserted of God, so that he actually trembled on the verge of positive

* He could not bear his own cross (Matt. xxvii: 32).

† Farrar's Life of Christ, Vol. 1, p. 149. Farrar takes the opposite ground.

transgression,—to be just what the Bible paints him, a young old man, worn out in the intolerable fight; warning others that they were implicated in his temptation (Matt. xxvii: 41); telling them that the spirit was willing but the flesh was weak (ib.); and glad, if it were possible, to have, either from them or God, help (v. 38) or deliverance (Jo. xii: 27).

CHAPTER VII.

Christ and Justification.

We would not have a separate chapter on Justification, were it not that the world is not corrected yet of the blunder which Luther taught it. Fourteen centuries of grace knew nothing of Luther's fable of a forensic justification. We were startled when we found that out. Theology is the highest arena of morals. Paying wages or selling merchandise is not the gravest sphere of honest accountability: but carving systems is; for it attempts to represent the saving truth of the Almighty. When, therefore, Chrysostom and Anselm, Aquinas and Augustine, and the whole church from our Saviour down, never lisp justification; I mean, never lisp it in the Protestant sense; and never lisp it in the Catholic sense, as that sense has been influenced in the Council of Trent and by the stamp put upon it since the time of Luther, it is not honest to train a student as the writer of this book has been trained; and if the defence be, We did not know it ourselves, then most eagerly let it

be said, Now that we may know it, and the fact has passed the lips, that for fourteen centuries, Augustine and all the saints made justification the same as sanctification (that is, only picturesquely and *ab origine verbi* not the same), the church should start up at once, and sensitively inquire whether this can possibly be true; and if it be, explain it, and not lie surd and recreant under such an intimation.

We have two chapters, however, one, "Christ and Justification," and one, "Christ and Sanctification," for their use *ad hominem*. The world believes in a Lutheran justification. Then, granting it were true, we wish to show (1) that Christ was justified; or, rather, to declare that, whatever justification means, Christ was the subject of the language; only we wish to add (2) that the use of the language in respect to Christ, refers to an inward justifying, and, therefore, favors subjective enrighteousment, also, in the case of his people.

(1) Now that Christ was "justified" is certain. "He was justified in the Spirit" (1 Tim. iii: 16).

We are told generally, that he was a subject of *grace*. If he was dead in Adam (1 Peter iii: 18), and quickened into life by his birth of the Holy Ghost (Rom. i: 4); and if he purchased that quickening by suffering on the cross under his own God-inspired obedience, then that help of the Godhead was a *grace*, and, on the side of Man, it is so spoken of through all the Scripture. He leaned upon it (Ps. xxxi: 1; lxix: 13–15; Jo. vi: 57), and asked it (Ps. xxii: 11, 19–21; Heb. v: 7). He gave thanks for it (Ps. xvi: 9–11; xviii: 46–50; xxii:

25). "The grace of God was upon him" (Lu. ii: 40). God pitied him (Ps. xviii: 50). Grace was poured into his lips (Ps. xlv: 2). God gave not the Spirit by measure to him (Jo. iii: 34); for "it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell" (Col. i: 19). But then, more in the line of righteousness itself, "He hath covered me with a robe of righteousness" (Is. lxi: 10). "I the Lord have called thee by righteousness" (Is. xlii: 6). "Rejoice greatly; behold thy King cometh unto thee, righteous and a saved one" (Zech. ix: 9).

Were justification forensic, therefore, or whatever it be regarded *in esse*, Christ would be covered by it in the language of the Bible. (2) But then justification is not forensic (see Author's "*Theology* and "*Com. on Romans*"). "Ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and BY THE SPIRIT OF OUR GOD" (1 Cor. vi: 11). This is Augustine's justification (Vol. 6, *Migne*, p. 250), and, confirmatory of this proper use of the word, it is the justification of Christ; for we are to imitate him as "the beginner and finisher of faith" (that is of his own faith*) as the one altogether made righteous, or, as Paul expresses it, "justified IN THE SPIRIT;" a testimony that all are that way; that he indeed wins sanctification for all of us (Jo. xvii: 19); but that Augustine is

* This passage interests me as referring to the personal faith of Christ. He is the only perfect example of it: and therefore we are to look to him "as the beginner and finisher of faith." "*Our* faith" shows its mistake by the Italics.

right that all justification of men is a making of the man righteous in the Holy Ghost. "By his knowledge," says Isaiah, that is subjectively, by the inward knowledge of himself, "shall My Righteous Servant justify many; and he shall bear their iniquity" (Is. liii: 11).

However that may be settled, though, Christ was certainly justified; and it had to be a justification by himself; there was no other man's obedience that could be imputed to him; and it had to be by his Other Nature, that is by his Godhead; "he trod the wine-press alone;" mine own arm brought salvation to me (Is. lxiii: 5); all of which is summed up, therefore, by Paul when he declares, that Christ was "justified in the Spirit."

CHAPTER VIII.

Christ and Adoption.

WHEN I adopt a child, he is not my child. But when God adopts, the case is figuratively different. He does not hesitate to mix figures.

"Adoption is an act of God's free grace whereby we are received as the sons of God."

The Bible does not hesitate, however, to speak of us as "begotten" of God. We are, therefore, his sons actually. Let me enumerate hastily some of the passages. "If any man be not begotten from above" (Jo. iii: 3). "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth" (Jas. i: 18). "He that doeth righteousness is born of him" (1 Jo. ii: 29).

Now, so it is with Christ. It is with Christ exactly as it would be if he were born like us. He would have to be elected (Lu. xxiii: 35), called (Is. xlix: 1), appointed (Heb. i: 2; iii: 2), raised up (Acts xiii: 33), anointed (Acts x: 38), with every sort of other fact that betokened selection and redemption,—to be the man intended to be Emmanuel. And then, on the other hand, "begetting" would be just as emphatic.

Let me consider this grander side, first. Gabriel actually explains it to the Virgin. "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God" (Lu i: 35). "The birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. i: 18). "That which is conceived of her is of the Holy Ghost" (v. 20). Therefore now let us notice fully that he is called the "Son of God," and that the decree is four times repeated, "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee" (Ps. ii: 7; Acts xiii: 33; Heb. i: 5; v: 5).

And yet, on the other hand, if our theory is true that he was accursed, and would have been apostate, and had to be redeemed; if we are to take it to be true that he was Incarnate God, but that he chose to be incarnated in apostate man, and that in order to be so incarnated he had to choose one, and to choose him from all eternity, and so beforehand to prepare for him as to send an angel to announce and to send the Spirit to beget him, so that in an ac-

cursed womb he might nevertheless be overshadowed with saving efficacy from the very first,—I say, if all this be so, "adoption" may well be talked of as well as generation; for then the Incarnate Whole is God over all blessed forever, and, at the same time, a selected mortal, called into the family of the faith, and called to be the head of it, and called to be so deluged by the Spirit as to be made, through blood and agony, to obey to our redemption.

Now listen to such announcements: — "Mine elect: I have put my Spirit upon him" (Is. xlii: 1). "The Lord hath called me from the womb" (Is. xli: 2). "Out of Egypt have I called my Son" (Matt. ii: 15). "I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son" (Heb. i: 5). "No man taketh this honor upon him, but he that was called of God, as was Aaron" (Heb. v: 5). "Because he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained" (Acts xvii: 31). "Born of the seed of David according to the flesh, and ordained * to be the Son of God in power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead" (Ro. i: 3, 4). "Called the Son of the Highest" (Lu. i: 32). "Christ, the chosen of God" (Lu. xxiii: 35). "God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ" (Acts ii: 36). "A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren like unto me"

* I translate "ordained" because the word is derived from fixing a boundary, and for the very consistent reason that the same word, on the same subject, in the text from Acts just quoted before it, is so translated.

(Acts iii: 22). "Therefore God thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows" (Ps. xlv: 7).

We quote amply. Now look at these. Not severally. But look at them in their connection. It is possible that, one by one, they might be wrested, so as to appear to cover other ground. But, in their most child-like apparency, do they not seem to say that God, having to become incarnate, chose a mortal; and that that mortal had to be redeemed; and that that redemption had to be from birth; and that that choice and that redeeming gives significance to these texts; because that it was "being made perfect, [that] he became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him" (Heb. v: 9).

CHAPTER IX.

Christ and Sanctification.

It must be continually kept in mind that I am not theorizing upon Christ, but that I am noting passages of the Word of God that have been kept out of our theories, and that need to be explained as absolute averments of the Holy Ghost. I am not saying that Christ was doomed (Matt. ii: 15); or that he was raised out of an apostacy (1 Pet. iii: 18); or that he was ransomed (Zech. ix: 9); or that he was justified (1 Tim. iii: 16), and called (Heb. v: 10); and saying that I could see this from the very theory of such a being. I could not. I am only saying, Here are these texts. I am only pleading, They have waked me up. Come and explain them

with me. I am helped by them as stepping stones: that is, I step from one to the other, but the only theory I make is the link of their connection. I do say that they all agree in the idea that Christ was lost in his inheritance from Adam.

But, now, is it not time to pause? Christ was sanctified (Jo. x: 36). How possibly am I to give an account of that?

Sanctification is that change in the sinner by which, after his regeneration, he is weaned gradually from wickedness, and "enabled to die unto sin and live unto righteousness." Christ teaches that we "must be born again." Our doctrine, therefore, is, that we are "converted," or "called," or "regenerated," however you choose to entitle it, at the beginning of our religious history, but that, as that only imparts the germ of grace, we are dealt with afterward, and slowly resist our sins, and climb out of our corrupt condition.

Now what had Christ to do with any such slow change as this?

Our very theory is, that he was "begotten"; that the Holy Ghost came down, and that the power of the Highest overshadowed; and, therefore, that that "holy thing" had complete perfection. Christ positively never sinned; and, from the first dawn of his being, his renewal was so complete, that no touch of iniquity ever stained his mind.

But I think we can understand how a nature could be shattered so that by itself it would sin (Mar. xiv; 38; xv: 34), and yet be held up by the sheer power of Omnipotence (Heb. v: 7). I think we can

understand humiliation and glorification. I think we can understand sin kept off by almost artificial assistances, and sin scoffed at by a better nature, where the Holy Ghost does not simply strive and rule, but where he lives and has become settled in the being.

These were the stages with Christ.

And, therefore, we are told positively, He was sanctified (Jo. xvii: 19). We are told of the means. Christ was not sanctified from sin (1 Pet. ii: 22); but he was sanctified in some way. For he was sanctified by the word (Jo. xvii: 19); and he was sanctified by suffering. He was made "perfect through suffering" (Heb. ii: 10). "Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered" (Heb. v: 8). And we are told that, "being made perfect, he became the author of eternal life unto all them that obey him" (v. 9).

Is there not a shadow of how this may be in the history of man? How are we sanctified? We gain strength as well as purity. We are not only weaned from sin, but we gather life in our second nature by the battle we are called to wage. What is the consequence? It is better for us to be in this world than to be moved immediately to heaven. Look at this, for a moment. If we are Christians, we are Kings. If we are kings, we are sovereigns over the universe. If we are sovereigns, all things are ours. If all things are ours, then we are on earth, simply because it is better than to be in heaven. If we were in heaven, we would be without sin. Then sanctification is not simply to make us without sin, but to lift high our moral nature; and the old man,

rugged with the storms of life, may be higher among the blessed, than the poor child snatched away into the everlasting Kingdom.

We see then how Christ may be sanctified, even though he never sinned. He may *learn* obedience: he may *settle* what is given him of grace: he may build-in of celestial stone what has been lent, so to speak, of moral scaffolding; and, instead of being racked by horrible temptation, he may win, at last, as we all do when we come to die, a second nature; that is, when we are glorified, something *pneumatical* instead of something *psychical* (1 Cor. xv: 44); a very body that responds to conscience (1 Cor. ix: 27); for which we are growing and prepared through the long fight of what we call our sanctification.

We are not responsible for what Christ means when he speaks of being sanctified (Jo. x: 36); but this is what we dream of it. He had to suffer (Heb. ix: 22), and he had to be obedient (Heb. vii: 26). His suffering was his temptation (Heb. xii: 4), and his obedience was his agony of resisting faithfulness. These were necessary in themselves. But, with all and beyond all, there was this other influence,—that they sanctified his spirit, and made the captain of our salvation perfect through suffering.

CHAPTER X.

Christ and Ordinances.

THERE comes in finely, then, a complete solution of many of the riddles of the Scripture.

Christ was circumcised!

According to our account he might as well be, as any of the meanest of his people. He was born of the lineage of Adam; and if he had to be cut off from his stock, and, as Paul expresses it, "separated from sinners" (Heb. vii: 26), his parents could have made no mistake. And Providence was not trifling with the history, when it allowed a solemn share of the ceremonial rite to be provided for the Redeemer. Indeed Paul bases everything upon it. For, making our cleansing flow from His cleansing, and our circumcision, spiritually considered, rest on His,—he speaks of our "putting off the body of the sins of the flesh in the circumcision of Christ" (Col. ii: 11).

Now, further, he was baptized! And the true way to press our argument is, to insist upon a solution. Why was Mary purified? Why does there linger so in the manuscripts the reading, "after the days of THEIR purification" (Lu. ii: 22). Why was our Saviour circumcised? And now, much more strongly; for this was his own act, voluntarily resorted to,—Why did he go to John, and, against the distinct warning of his forerunner, insist upon receiving baptism? (Matt. iii: 15).

Neander * tells us it was official. But how foolish to talk so! Why should Christ mislead us by confusing what was intended for the people? Why should he snatch to another use a simple and easily darkened ceremonial? Neander says, It was his ordination. But why? We might give it a thousand meanings. Why did not Christ say so? Neander says, It could not mean his baptism. There is the

* *Gesch. Apos. Zeit.* p. 642, *note.*

very point. Our very doctrine shows it must and could. It becomes a gloss to the other texts, and shows, what all baptism shows, that Christ needed cleansing; that is, that he needed to be *Christ*;* that is, that he must be born from above: and though he was never cleansed as we are cleansed, I mean partially; and though he was never "born" as we are "born," namely, after we have sinned: though he was "born" redeemed, and "begotten" in the womb, and never saw corruption (Acts ii: 31),—yet it belonged to him so by Adam, that he might be baptized rightfully as we are, and baptized after his cleansing, just as we are, after we are born from above (Acts viii: 37).

Again, the priests! What did they wash for? (2 Chr. iv: 6). The high priest! Why was he perpetually making lustration? (Ex. xl: 31; Lev. viii: 12, 30).

And now, notice one thing about the Bible. Not only is Christ perpetually spoken of as tempted, and infirm, and compassed about with weakness, but, just like one of us fighting for his life, the whole is said to depend upon the High Priest keeping clean. The cases are everywhere. Christ must be obedient unto death; or else there is no hope of any body's salvation.

"If thou wilt walk in my ways," Jehovah told him, "then I will give thee companions among them that walk with thee" (Zech. iii: 7). "He was heard, in that he feared," the apostle says (Heb. v: 7). "O God thou knowest as to † my foolishness (that

* Anointed. † See the preposition.

is, thou knowest that I have none); and my guiltiness" (just exactly of what sort it is) "is not hid from thee. Deliver me out of the mire, and let me not sink. Draw nigh unto my soul, and redeem it. The humble shall see and be glad; and your hearts shall live that seek God" (Ps. lxix: 5, 14, 18, 32).

I cannot repeat all the passages. The burden of all is, that Christ's power to save lay in his saving himself. "Who through the Eternal Spirit offered himself WITHOUT SPOT to God" (Heb. ix: 14). "For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified through the truth" (Jo. xvii: 19). "Righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins" (Is. xi: 5). "Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness. THEREFORE God hath blessed thee forever" (Ps. xlv: 7). "The sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre" (v. 6). "He became obedient unto death: WHEREFORE God hath highly exalted him" (Phil. ii: 8, 9). "And, being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him" (Heb. v: 9).

Excuse the length of our list. He who said, "I have found David my servant," had only to add, "With my holy oil have I anointed him" (Ps. lxxxix: 20), to show how stoutly, and yet how humanly; how triumphantly in the end, and yet how agonizingly and hazardously through all the way, Jesus Christ, our incarnate God, fought the battle as a poor lost man saved by grace, but bearing all the way the miserable marks of an undone and terrible inheritance.

CHAPTER XI.

Christ and Glorification.

THERE came a time when Christ ascended into heaven, and sat at the right hand of God. There are many mysterious things said about the change. He told his disciples, "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you" (Jo. xvi: 7). He told Mary, "Touch me not," that is, not with high hopes of his highest gifts; for he could not bestow them yet. "I am not yet ascended unto my Father" (Jo. xx: 17). By our old notions this was rather meaningless. But if we take the idea that Christ was a heritor from Adam, then the Divine Man, like the common man, had a period of the "psychical body" of which Paul speaks. That is, being held up like you or me by the sheer power of grace from lapsing into sin, he had a carnal nature which reigned all through his earthly humiliation; which was subdued by "the things which he suffered" (Heb. v: 8); which was fought against and everywhere conquered; and which, though held in submission by the Spirit without measure given, yet evermore threatened, and evermore leaned over the gulf of positive and possible iniquity. But when Christ rose, he changed his nature. The "body psychical" gave place to one "pneumatical." When Paul says, "There is a psychical body, and there is a pneumatical body" (1 Cor. xv: 44), we do not understand an *ethereal* body at judgment. That may be as it may be. But we understand, a

holy body; not one, as in the case of Christ, HELD IN HOLINESS by the supreme efficiency of the Spirit, but one naturally holy; no longer drilled and trained and striven with by a Visitor from abroad, but the home of that Visitor; incorporated with Him; now no longer His arena for a fight, but His throne to everlasting; the place of His abiding seat; glorious now in its strength, and quiet as a second nature.

Christ's glorification, therefore, was like man's glorification, with essential differences. Man's glorification was a release from sin. Christ never sinned. Man's glorification will take place hereafter (Col. iii: 4). Christ's glorification has already taken place. Man's glorification is lower. Christ's glorification is ineffable, as one with God. But, with these differences, there are similarities, which, with our view, become unspeakably more complete. Man's glorification is a rising to an untempted, unweakened condition of obedience. So is Christ's. His battle is over.

Now with this pneumatical life, where the Spirit reigns instead of battles, there are, as it might naturally be anticipated, changes of authority. Even the saint shall have his kingdom over the "five cities" (Lu. xix: 19). And though we do not understand entirely why "the Holy Ghost was not yet, because that Jesus was not yet glorified" (Jo. viii: 39), we do understand, in the first place, that this was only comparatively; as when Christ said, "They had not had sin" (Jo. xv: 22); or when Paul says, "Christ sent me not to baptize" (1 Cor. i: 17); and we do

understand, in the second place, that it would not be in the least unnatural that Christ, with higher glory, should have higher reign; that Christ, escaped from Adam, should climb upon the throne; that Christ, with his case decided, should have its promises fulfilled; and that Christ, having actually paid the ransom, should have now higher power than those anticipative good things which a trust that he would conquer wrung out, in advance, from the law of the Almighty.

So we explain everything. And when Jesus, remembering the touch of the diseased woman (Mar. v: 30), says to Mary, "Touch me not," for the highest gifts, that I have often talked with thee about, cannot be responsive to thy touch till I am ascended to the Father, it throws a beautiful light on all our theory; which is, that he was of our fallen Adam; that he did not cease to be so till he rose to heaven; that he was staid from sin, or otherwise he never could have risen to redemption; but that he was not staid from moral weakness; that is, that he was not staid from a fleshliness (Heb. v: 2) that could be wrung by moral temptation; that he was accursed, therefore, all through his life; and that it was only when he rose to paradise, that the *psuchikon* put on the *pneumatikon*, and that an easy holiness reigned and became natural in a carnal heritor.

CHAPTER XII

Christ and God.

It becomes now intensely interesting to ask, how God could become one with such a man.

In the first place, God never could become one with man at all. This is the opinion of the most mediæval orthodoxy.

But then I must explain exactly what I mean by such an assertion; for, thus nakedly standing, it will surprise many a reader, and awake an impetuous, No! against such an assault upon our creed.

But my meaning is simple. I mean that in the very simplest, and therefore the most important sense, God is not one with man, and could not be possibly.

The "Confession" says that Christ is "very man." Now if Christ is "very man," he has "a true body and a reasonable (reasoning) soul": and if he is a true man in these respects, he is finite; and, moreover, he is a creature, and the creature must be distinct from the Creator. I shall cloud the thing if I pause. No mortal ever dreamed that the child of Mary was God in the most natural and simple sense.

But then he is God in certain senses, and that is why I think Paul chose *isa* instead of *ison* in his famous sentence (Phil. ii: 6). He is God (Rom. ix: 5), and ought to be worshipped (Heb. i: 6); and many a man will shrink from our view of his hu-

manity, because it sinks him lower, and makes it harder to think of him as in truth the Son of God.

But let us look at all this, and let us make a list now of the *isa* (Phil. ii: 6), and show in what particulars Christ is God to the glory of God the Father.

1. And in the first place, to use a thought that will allow for every mystery, he is God just as far as the Omnipotent Jehovah *could* deify an elected and anointed intelligence. Making the universe, it would be strange if he could not elect a creature, and build everything around him. One might suspect he would; for, being invisible, why should he not select a being, and become incarnate in him for his creatures? Because, "no being hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." This shall be our first answer then. Christ is God in every sense in which God by the use of his Omnipotence could unite himself with a creature.

2. And, therefore, secondly, he is God in the Spirit.

This is the celestial way of explaining his Godhead. "And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God" (Lu. i: 35). This makes *Christ* his great appellative—the Anointed One. And this Paul notices, "Determined on as* the Son of God in power, according to the Spirit of holiness" (Romans i: 3). Christ is not particular to call Him Spirit, but

* Compare (E. V.) Acts xvii: 31.

says, "The Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works" (Jo. xiv: 10). He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father" (v. 9). And the prophets talk boldly of "God." They call him Emmanuel; and they address him (Ps. cx: 1). "Jehovah said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." In *substantial* ways, therefore, the Spirit is the incarnated Deity.

3. But in *authoritative* ways! There will be another aspect.

I will state at once three particulars (*isa*) in which Christ is God; first, *substantially*, in that he is the incarnated Spirit; second, *authoritatively*, in that "all power is given unto [him] in heaven and in earth" (Matt. xxviii: 18); and third, *forensically*, in that he stands for God. By eternal covenant his name is the Father's name; and by federal law, which has passed the inspection of eternity, his sacrifice is God's sacrifice, and they are so federally and substantially the same, that what Christ suffered in the fight is as though God endured it, under the pressure of intolerable iniquities.

Authority, therefore, to recur that way, is asserted everywhere. "Christ is head over all things to the church" (Eph. i: 22). He is able to say, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." We are to know what is the exceeding greatness of God's power, "which he wrought in Christ when he set him far above all principality and power and might and dominion and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come" (Eph. i: 20, 21). *Authority* therefore, is to be one feature·

4. And now next comes the *forensic* claim.

He is "Jehovah our Righteousness" (Jer. xxiii : 6).

And we cannot exaggerate this. It is complete. "Through the Eternal Spirit he offered himself without spot to God" (Heb. ix : 14). He died as though God died. He atoned as though God atoned. And therefore, no oracle shrinks. They say boldly, "Feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood" (Acts xx : 28).

(1) As *a mystery*, therefore, that is beyond what any body can fathom : (2) as *omnipotency*, therefore, making the man a God as far as the supreme Jehovah could make any of his creatures : (3) as *incarnation*, the holy substance being the Spirit born within : (4) as *kingship* awarded by authority : and (5) as *headship* by an eternal covenant,—the Deity is to be adored in Christ, and these are the points level to the worship of his people.

But then they do not forbid his having been lost.

We are always at a disadvantage as to our mode of speech.

How much more beautiful the expression, "Born from among the dead" (Col. i : 18).

Jesus Christ was never really lost.

But that he was doomed by lineage, does not in the least interfere with all these points of his divinity.

Once cumber him with guilt, and it may be herited guilt as well as that under the new dispensation. He was infirm (Heb. v : 2). The deeper and the deadlier, all the grander if he bore the triumph. He was tempted. That we have always known. If it shattered him, and snatched at his very life, all the

657338

more was he a man, and all the more, God, if he won the victory.

Take the peculiarities apart. (1) A mystery! It scarcely colors the mystery. (2) Omnipotence! If it could make Gabriel God, it could scarce be grander if it were a child of Adam. (3) The Spirit! It would befit his work. (4) Authority! A lost nature could be lifted to it as well as another. (5) Forensically he had guilt at any rate; and therefore there is nothing in these relations to God, that this brand plucked from the burning could not be fitted for as well as an un-Adamic Redeemer.

III.

CONCLUSION.

BUT it will be angrily uttered, Who dare thus change everything? The flush of anxiety will stand, as though at the very tomb of Christ, and say, 'They will take away my Lord, and I know not where they will lay him! Some schemings touch the outskirts of religion; but this ruins all of it. In the first place, it touches the very person of Christ; in the second place, it awakes the scandal of uncertainty; and in the third place it breeds this retort, How can you who are but a single reader of the word of God, and not very profound or discreet at that, set yourself in array against the tried doctrine of all mankind?'

There is something intimidating in this. And after the ripple of resentment, there follows a dead tide which is much more formidable still. Where is this change to end? And how can we anchor anywhere, if the faith *ubique et ab omnibus* is thus to be thrust aside by the speculations of a single mind?

Let us exhaust this sort of speech.

It will be said further,—Christ is simple. This was upheld, and was made a bright symptom of his excellence in the old conception of his person. (1) He was simple in his being,—Incarnate God, and

perfect unincumbered man. To make him of the earth earthy, and to debase him as an heir of ruin, is travelling a great way round, and reaching, in anticipative ways, the great trophies of his victories. (2) He was simple in his work. That is, the questions of life are much more easily met than by this new conception of redemption. "He that spared not his own Son, but freely gave him up for us all," was doing that which is much more easily understood if the child of Mary was aloof from Adam, than if we had to wade through all this retroactive thought, and reach our life through life first won back for our Emmanuel. (3) Again, he was simple in character. He knew no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth. It confuses everything, to imagine him attaint. It strains everything, to conceive of this attainder as lifted from him by his death. And though he never sinned under the curse, yet that he was tempted to it by heredity native in the flesh, bewilders all our faith, and spoils all our reverence for this great Omnipotent.

Now, let us answer everything. In the first place, the scandal! In olden time the unbroken faith was, that it was right to persecute. The Pagan persecuted the Christian. The Christian persecuted the Pagan. It was a settled doctrine. When Paul said, "Deliver such an one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh" (1 Cor. v: 5), the world leaped there at once. Hittites and Jebusites, under the old theocratic rule, personated *ab ictu* recusant believers; and the world's cup of faith filled itself up at once, and century after century did nothing to correct the evil.

Did that make it right?

Again, the power of Kings! Paul is again the teacher (Rom. xiii: 4; 1 Pet. ii: 17); and Christ (Matt. xxiii: 2). The world, we are to understand, when it sets a certain sense upon the sayings of Christ, seals it: that seems the argument; and *ubique et ab omnibus* are to be infallible, like the work of the Spirit.

Now, I believe in infallibility: and here lies what is plausible in the intended argument. When Christ says, "On this rock I will build my church:" or when he says, "I am with you always;" or when Paul *probably* says, that "the church" is "the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Tim. iii: 15),—they do undoubtedly mean, that saving truth shall never fade from the earth. But what is saving truth? But yesterday all the Church believed in the "mystical presence." To-day, the most do. Then it is true? Can man or God warrant any such affirmation at our hands?

But if it be not true, who shall say so? If the pent flood bore its way out through the burrow of a worm, is it audacious in the worm? Think of these things. The lion is crowded in a net. Then it is wicked in the mouse to gnaw it, and to cut him out?

Is not the true doctrine this? that if the church lights her fires, the weakest may put them out? If the Jacobites rule, may not the peasant teach them better things? And if *ubique* the wafer pronounces itself God, may not the poor, loneliest monk upset the understanding of the Word, and all the more

proclaim that "the gates of hell shall never prevail against us?"

And now in regard to *simplicity!* (1) Where is the simplicity in Christ, if, like Gabriel, or like Lucifer, he comes from a foreign shore?

Deism is more simple than Christianity; that is, in form it seems to be: but does it explain more simply the great facts of our salvation? Christ is more simple, if created at a blow; but if a prophet the Lord our God has raised up to us of his brethren like unto us, may not the picture that has the fewer points be, like Deism, the least capacitated to explain the difficulties?

(2) So of ransom. "The lamb without blemish and without spot" might seem, if in the sense that has been prescriptive, to be more simple to explain the sacrifice; but if the sacrifice be suffering, and if the suffering be obedience, and if there be statements of the very fiercest temptation, and if, along with these temptations, there be statements of the very most dreadful risk, and, along with that, of a being rendered perfect by suffering, tell me,—which is simplest, that which gathers all these six in one, or that which leaves them at loose ends to be explained as mysteries?

Let me dwell upon this.

Our Saviour had a battle: what was it? It was a mystery. He was tempted. How? Being "holy, harmless, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens," how did temptation reach him? I mean under the old system? You have nothing to say but that it was a mystery. Again, he suffered

But so did the thief. Tell me what his sufferings consisted in. You venture a little way here, and say, It was anger. But what sort of anger? Did not his Father love him? Did Christ lose his mind by becoming a glorious Redeemer? You say, His Father hid himself. I have no doubt of it, but how? Could Christ put on a *guise* of terror; or could there be a hallucination of wrath, under which he could assume a torture? And then in respect to obedience (Heb. v: 8); why so difficult? And in respect to being "made perfect," How possibly can all these things be wrought in one? And why should that be thought simple that leaves all these useless for the teaching of the people?

But let me drop one magic word—Adam. Give me one text of Peter, "Made a dead man by the flesh" (1 Pet. iii: 18). Let me have one phrase out of the Vulgate, "*Primogenitus e mortuis*"; * and then one line from the Apostle, Being "quickened together with him" (Col. ii: 13),—and all these mysteries approach, and take off their masks by mutual assistance. These were the riddles of our faith. Now they can be built upon. Temptation! It was incident to his lineage. Suffering! It was the fruit of his temptation. Obedience! It was a most fearful battle. And perfecting himself! He did it like you or me. Only he was the God Incarnate. He had the Spirit without "measure" (Jo. iii: 34); or, as one codex has it, without "part"; that is without just a part as we have it, leaving the rest to sin; but nevertheless, not so without measure that his Deity

* "The first-born from the dead."

did not leave him, I mean the man Christ; did not stint him of his power as in the garden of Gethsemane; and did not leave him on the cross, to shrink with a scream of agony from the last passion of his life, viz., a fear of wreck, just as he was anchoring within the veil.

(3) Third, character; it brings me nearer to my Redeemer. Before, he was an alien, a something outside of me. Now, he is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh.

And this pleases me in three particulars: first, as an example. Before he was a mystery. I could not see how he was an example at all. He took things easily; *i. e.*, he had a good nature; and though he was "compassed about with infirmity," I could not see how. There was a gravel stone in the socket of the cross. Now the cross sits straight in its morticed hold. I understand it perfectly: he was a poor tortured heritor. He was "tempted," blessed be God! as well as "slain by the sword"; and now I understand that the latter was heaven in contrast with the former. And when the Apostle tells me to fight also my battle, "looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of *our* faith," I see why "*our*" was not put in the original; and why it should not appear at all. I see that it was Christ's faith of which Christ was the finisher; and that, under the hard torments under which he began and rendered it complete (Ps. xxii: 8, 19), he becomes a pattern for me, to fight and run my race of a new obedience.

Again, he can pity me. It seems Christ craved grace as well as I. He will not be arrogant over me.

He was a poor "worm;" for Isaiah is bold enough to say, "An abomination is he that chooseth you" (Is. xli: 24). And if any man says to me, "Who maketh thee to differ? and what hast thou that thou hast not received?" 1 Cor. iv: 7), Christ will not renounce my brotherhood, even there. As God, he is all my salvation; as man, he is a child of the curse, lifted out of it by grace, and made to possess a splendid difference, by being one person with the Most High.

Once more; he gets strong hold of me because he is close by me, one of ourselves. Had he been an angel, his fingers would have been ice. Had he been from Saturn or from Uranus, some gallant fighter who had observed the law—had he been from the womb of Mary by some far off and alien power, I must have submitted, and bent that way the yearnings of my confidence: but as he is from *me*, that is from the sad stock to which I and my house belong, I grasp him better. It may not be so with others. I look at him as I look at Adam. And as I am quieted under the imputations of guilt, when I see it like the acorn from the oak dropping from the very fountains of my blood, so I can take hold more of Christ, when I sweep him under the thought,—"God has made of one blood all nations for to dwell on all the face of the earth" (Acts xvii: 26); and, when I look upon the millions of my kin, can look on One, crowned and blessed; and, gazing on Adam, whose guilt has settled on the rest, can gaze also on Christ, and see the finger of the King pointing to him in that glorious decree, "The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all."